National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SIDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. Without Concealment....Without Compromise. EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } CORRESPONDING EDITORS.

VOL. XI....NO. 2. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1850. WHOLE NO. 522.

Published Weekly,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
AT 112 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS:
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. GAY, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. GAY, New-York.

Norris & Brother, Printers.

Selections.

SPEECH
OF
S. P. CHASE OF OHIO.

In the Senate of the United States, March 26-7, 1850.

On the Compromise Resolutions submitted by Mr. CLAY, *on the 25th of January.*

(Concluded from Vol. X....No. 50.)

I am very far, therefore, from concurring in the views of the honorable Senator from Massachusetts in regard to the obligation to admit new slave States out of Texas. I confess, sir, that I was somewhat surprised by the argument which he addressed to us. I was aware that no one had more zealously opposed the admission of Texas than that distinguished Senator. In his strongest language—and no man uses stronger language—he had denied the constitutionality of the resolutions of annexation. After the adoption of these resolutions, and after compliance with the conditions and acceptance of the guarantees tendered by them, on the part of Texas, when, according to the argument of the Senator from Georgia, delivered upon that occasion, the faith of the Government was firmly bound, he had still spoken and voted against her admission. This determined and unyielding opposition was understood to be based not only upon a conviction of the unconstitutionality of the measure, but also upon a fixed and settled hostility to the extension of Slavery, and to the increase, in either branch of the legislature, or in any department of the Government, of the slave power. I was startled, therefore, when I heard the Senator declare, not only that he regarded the constitutionality of the admission of Texas as a matter adjudged, and not now open to question in any way; but that, when the proper time for the enactment shall arrive, Congress will be bound to admit four new slave States out of Texas. Sir, I deny this obligation. The history of those resolutions was known to the country and known to Texas. It is, and was at the time, known, and well known, that those resolutions could not have been carried except upon the assurance of Mr. Polk, the President elect, that he would adopt the latter of the alternatives presented by them, which contemplated negotiation and a treaty. It is, and was, well known, also, that President Tyler, availing himself of the last days of his official power, took the matter out of the hands of the President elect, and adopted the course of proceeding authorized by the first of those alternatives.

Sir, I will go as far as any man to maintain and uphold the constitutionally plighted faith of the Government; but when a claim is put forth under resolutions, so adopted and so acted upon, it must be shown that the claim is warranted by a fair construction of the stipulation, and it must be shown further that the stipulation itself is warranted by the Constitution. We have had too much, quite too much of constitutional amendment by legislation and resolution.

Now, sir, I undertake further to say, that the guarantee asserted to exist by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, "the new States *shall* be made out of Texas, and that such States as are to be formed out of that portion of it lying South of 36 deg. 30 min. may come in, *to the number of four*, in addition to the State then in existence, and admitted by these resolutions," is not to be found in the resolutions. In the first place, the resolutions do not say that any new State, "*shall*" be formed out of Texas. They provide that "new States, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, *and having sufficient population*, MAY *hereafter*, by the consent of said State, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be entitled to admission *under the provisions of the Federal Constitution*." Where is that absolute "*shall?*" And what are the "provisions" referred to? The *shall* does not exist. The provisions are these: "No new State shall be formed within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States without the consent of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress." Now, this is either an absolute prohibition upon the erection of any new State within the limits of an existing State, or it is a prohibition of such erection without the consent of Congress. It is, at least, certain, then, that the resolutions themselves make the admission of States, erected out of Texas, dependent on the consent of the Congress in being at the time the application may be made. Consent of Congress is an important qualification of the asserted guarantee. I need say no more on this point.

I will add only that, whatever may be the true construction of the resolutions, or their obligatory force under the Constitution, it is quite certain that we are under no obligation to be active at this time in carving a new State out of Texas: and there is no great reason for apprehension that Texas will soon propose to divide herself, if Congress does not meddle in the matter.

As to the Texan debt, Mr President, I am disposed to leave that where the resolutions of annexation left it—with Texas. Let Texas keep her lands and her debt. That was the sense of Congress, then, and I see no reason for any change of position. If there are debts for which the United States are liable, in default of payment by Texas, let us wait till the default is established, and then look into the amounts and grounds of liability, and do what justice and good faith require.

The unadjusted boundary of Texas presents other but not very difficult questions. The resolutions of annexation do not provide for the admission, as a State, of the entire Republic of Texas with the boundaries claimed by her. This is the language of the resolutions: "Congress doth consent that the territory *properly included within* and *rightfully belonging to* the Republic of Texas, may be erected into a new State, to be called the State of Texas." All questions of boundary are reserved, subject to adjustment by the Government of the United States. The simple question, then, is: What territory was "properly included within and rightfully belonging to" Texas, as an independent republic, prior to annexation? Two propositions respecting this matter seem to me to be clear. *First*, all the territory between the Nueces and the Sabine, and extending north to the Red River and the Ensenada, comprehending, according to the report of the Commissioner of the Land Office, 148, 569 square miles, being four and a half times as large as Ohio, was properly included within and did rightfully belong to Texas at the date of annexation, and is therefore properly comprehended within the new State; *secondly*, none of that territory north of a line drawn from Paso del Norte to the Ensenada, and with that stream to Red river, known as New Mexico or the Santa Fé country, was properly included within or did rightfully belong to Texas at that date, and none of it therefore was a part of *the* Texas admitted into the Union.

The territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande, and South of Paso and the Ensenada, may be regarded as open to controversy. Petitions have been presented in this Chamber, since the commencement of the session from a portion of the inhabitants, declaring their conviction that the country is not within the rightful limits of Texas, and asking for a territorial government. Another portion recognize the jurisdiction of Texas. We need take no action at present, but may await further information and future events.

Some reliance has been placed on Disturnell's map, a copy of which is annexed to the treaty with Mexico, as showing all the territory east of the Rio Grande to be within the limits of Texas. That map is now before me, and also an earlier map, from the same plate, published in 1844, by White, Gallagher, and White. Upon this latter map the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande, and North of the Ensenada, is represented as constituting parts of Tamaulipas, Coahuila, and New Mexico, or Santa Fé. Disturnell's map was published in 1847. The plate was altered in conformity with information obtained from the departments of the Government here. The line of the Nueces is marked as the "original boundary of Texas in 1835." The Rio Grande, below the mouth of the Puerco, is marked as the "boundary claimed by the United States." Tamaulipas no longer appears to extend across the lower Rio Grande to the Nueces. But Coahuila still extends across the river; and above Paso del Norte and the Ensenada, the whole country is designated "Nuevo Mejico, o Santa Fé." I see not what aid the claim of Texas can derive from this map, which certainly contains no language on its face which will sustain it, and which is referred to in the treaty only to fix the western and southern boundaries of New Mexico, west of the Rio Grande.

It is said also that the United States, having been constituted the arbiter between Mexico and Texas by the resolutions of annexation, and having become possessed of the territory in dispute by conquest or purchase, is estopped from denying the claim of Texas. Is this so? Let me put a case. Two neighbors dispute about their boundary, and refer the question to an arbiter. Pending the controversy, the arbiter buys the interest of one. Is he, therefore, bound to concede the tract in dispute to the other? Clearly not. He has acquired the title of one, and, with it, whatever right his grantor possessed. And it is now his business to adjust the controversy fairly and peaceably, if he can; if not, to refer it to another arbiter.

In my judgment, therefore, our plain duty at present is, to provide a territorial government for New Mexico, which should embrace within its jurisdiction the whole country north of Paso and the Ensenada. But it does not seem to me indispensably important that the precise limits of its jurisdiction should be defined. The valley of the Rio Grande is the only part which is at present peopled, except by Indians, and the only part, therefore, which urgently requires an established government. The territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande, south of the line of New Mexico, can be left open to future adjustment, upon further information as to the views of the people and the rights of Texas.

Mr. President, the fifth, sixth, and eight resolutions of the Senator from Kentucky embrace three propositions, which I propose to consider together.

1. That Slavery in this District should not be abolished, except with the consent of the District and of Maryland.

2. That the slave trade in this District ought to be abolished.

3. That Congress has no power to prohibit the slave trade among the States.

I concur fully in the second of these propositions, and that the honorable Senators from Kentucky [Mr. Clay] and from Alabama [Mr. King] for the favor they have shown to this measure.

I cannot concur in the first proposition. I have already said that, in my judgment, the Constitution confers on Congress no power to enforce the absolute subjection of one man to the disposal of another man as property. It is my opinion that all legislation adopted or enacted by Congress for enforcing that condition ought to be repealed, whether in this District or elsewhere. I listened with great pleasure to the emphatic declaration of the Senator from Kentucky, in respect to the extension of Slavery by Congress, that he would give 'no vote to propagate wrongs?" What wrongs? Why, sir, those wrongs, mutiplied and complicated, which are summed up in one word—SLAVERY. And where is the warrant for this comprehensive condemnation of Slavery? It is found in that LAW—to assert the supremacy of which here seems to some so censurable—that law of sublimer origin and more awful sanction than any human code, written in ineffaceable characters upon every heart of man, which condemns all injustice and all oppression as a violation of that injunction which commands us to do unto others as we would that others should do unto us.

If the Senator from Kentucky was right—and who did not feel that he was right?—in saying that he would give no vote to *propagate wrongs*, am I not right in saying that I will give no vote to *perpetuate wrongs?* Sir, I will give no vote for the perpetuation or continuance of Slavery in this District. I deny any implied obligation to the people of Maryland to continue Slavery here as long as it is continued there. No evidence can be produced of any such an understanding. The state of public sentiment in Maryland and in Virginia at the time of the cession warrants the belief that the understanding and expectation, if there was any, was very different from that supposed. But, whatever the understanding or expectation may have been, our duty seems to me plain. The power of exclusive legislation over this District is confided to us. We are bound to use it so as to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty for all within its reach.

I was surprised, Mr. President, by the proposition that Congress has no power to prohibit the slave trade between the States. Why, sir, that trade is prohibited now, except upon certain conditions. It is prohibited in vessels of less capacity than forty tons. Not a slave can be shipped coast-wise without a permit from an officer of the United States: not a slave shipped can be landed without such a permit. Any one who will take the trouble to consult the act of 1807 will see how this matter stands. I do not think that law unconstitutional. The Constitution confers on Congress power "to regulate commerce among the several States." Congress exercised this power in enacting that law. If they might enact that, they may enact others. If they can prohibit the trade in vessels of less than forty tons, they can probibit it in vessels of one hundred, five hundred—altogether. And why should not Congress prohibit this traffic? We hear much of the cruelty of the African slave trade. Our laws denounce against those engaged in it the punishment of death. Is it less cruel, less deserving of punishment, to tear fathers, mothers, children from their homes and each other, in Maryland and Virginia, and transport them to the markets of Louisiana on Mississippi? If there be a difference in cruelty and wrong, is it not in favor of the African and against the American slave trade? Why, then, should we be guilty of the inconsistency of abolishing *that* by the sternest prohibition, and continuing *this* under the sanction of national law?

The seventh proposition of the Senator from Kentucky contemplates more effectual provision for the extradition of fugitive slaves.

I was sorry to hear the Senator from Massachusetts say, the other day, that he proposed to support the bill on this subject, with the amendment to it, reported from the Judiciary Committee, "with all its provisions, to their fullest extent." I ask Senators, who propose to support that bill, where they find the power to legislate on this subject in the Constitution? I know to what clause I shall be referred. I know I shall be told that the Constitution provides that "no person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." But this clause contains no grant of legislative power to Congress. That power is conferred exclusively by special clauses, granting legislative power in respect to particular subjects, and by the eighth section of the first article, which after enumerating the specific powers of Congress, proceeds to declare that Congress shall have power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Now, sir, what power is vested, by the clause, in relation to fugitives from service, in the Government, or in any department or officer of the Government? None at all; and if none, then the legislative power of Congress does not extend to the subject. The clause is a clause of compact. It has been so denominated by every Senator who has had occasion to speak of it. The honorable Senator from Massachusetts told us that he "always thought that the Constitution addressed itself to the Legislatures of the States or to the State, themselves; that he had always been of the opinion that it was an injunction upon the States themselves." If this opinion be correct, the power of legislation and the duty of legislation must be with the States, and not with Congress.

Mr. BUTLER.—I interrupt the Senator merely with a view to obtain what I regard as important to the consideration of this matter. If some of the States who are parties to this compact refuse to pass such laws as will fulfil their obligations, where is the remedy?

Mr. CHASE.—I know of no remedy. None has been provided by the Constituuon. But let me put a question to the Senator from South Carolina. The Constitution provides among these articles of compact, of which the stipulation in regard to fugitives from service is one, that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." Now, I ask the Senator if he admits, that, under that clause, Congress has power to provide penalties for the imprisonment of colored citizens of Massachusetts in the ports and under the laws of South Carolina?

Mr. BUTLER.—I take the broad ground that each State has a right to prescribe its own qualifications of citizenship. In all the old acts of Congress the class of persons referred to by the Senator are spoken of as persons of color as contra distinguished from citizens. I believe it is in the power of every State to make a full citizen of a black man, but not to make him a full citizen of of any other State. The definition of a citizen in South Carolina is not governed by what may be the definition of a citizen in another State. I believe that each State can determine the qualifications of voters and control as it pleases the rights of different classes of persons. But the Senator has not answered or met the question I have asked, and that is, in case a State refuses to carry out the provisions of the article in the Constitution, where is the power to compel it to do so?

Mr. CHASE.—I certainly answered the Senator distinctly and candidly. I said I knew of no remedy in case of the refusal of a State to perform its stipulations. The obligation of the compact, and the extent of the compact are, as in every other case of treaty stipulation, matters which address themselves exclusively to the good faith and sound judgment of the parties to it. But did the Senator answer my question? He has not told us whether, in his judgment, the General Government has power to enforce that constitutional compact which guaranties to the citizens of each State the rights of citizens in all the States. He has told us that each State determines for itself who shall be its citizens. I grant it. He says one State cannot determine who shall be a citizen of another. That may be so. But when a State has once determined who its own citizens shall be, the compact stipulates that they shall have the privileges of citizens in every other State. Not that they shall *be* citizens—not that they shall be admitted to the elective franchise, or be made eligible to office; but that they shall have those rights and immunities, that security and that protection to which citizens generally, male or female, minors or adults, are entitled. My question was, Has the General Government, in the judgment of the Senator, power under the Constitution to enforce the performance of this stipulation in South Carolina?

But I have been drawn aside from the line of argument I intended to pursue.

I repeat, Mr. President, that this clause in relation to fugitives from service is a clause of compact. For many years after the adoption of the Constitution it was so regarded. It was not much discussed, and the limits of the respective powers of the State and Federal Governments under it were not very accurately settled. But nearly all the States legislated under it, and provided such provisions for the extradition of fugitives as they deemed consistent with the security of the personal rights of their own inhabitants. At length, however, the Prigg decision was made, which asserted the exclusive right and duty of Congress to legislate on this subject, and denied that right and duty to the States. The same decision suggested, what every one here will admit, that Congress could not require State officers to intervene in the business of extradition. It need surprise no one that after this the States ceased to enact extradition laws, or that some of them repealed those they had before enacted, and prohibited the intervention of their officers.

But, sir, a decision of the Supreme Court cannot alter the Constitution. If Congress had no power to legislate on this subject before the decision, Congress has none now. The decision determined the case before the court. It established a precedent for the determination of such cases. It must stand till overruled. But I do not see how any Senator who finds himself unable, after the fullest consideration, to concur in the principle of the decision, can justify himself in the exercise of a power which he does not believe the Constitution has conferred.

What, sir, is the history of this clause and the clauses of like character which stand with it in the Constitution? This clause was taken from the ordinance of 1787. In the ordinance no one pretends that it was anything more than an article of compact. No power was derived from it to the Government. Three other clauses of the same nature are found in the same article of the Constitution: one stipulating for the extradition of fugitives from justice; another stipulating that the citizens of each State shall have the immunities of citizens in all the other States; and a third stipulating that full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State. All these clauses are taken from the Articles of Confederation, where they stood as articles of compact, binding the good faith of the States, but conferring no power on the Government. Can a good reason be given by any one why they should have a different operation in the Constitution? It seems evident that the framers of the Constitution did not suppose that the General Government could enforce the execution of these clauses, or any of them, without special provision. For, coupled with the clause respecting records, we find a special power conferred on Congress to "prescribe, by general laws, the manner in which the record shall be proved, and the effect thereof." This grant of a special power in respect to records, and this omission to grant any power in respect to the other subjects afford the strongest possible implication that the Constitutional Convention did not design to grant any such power. Had the grant of the special power as to records been omitted, that clause would have been a stipulation precisely like the other clauses, and having the same effect; no more, no less; no narrower no broader. It would have been binding on the States; but no power could have been derived from it to Congress. To enable Congress to legislate, a special grant was necessary. The omission of any special grant of power to legislate upon the subject-matter of the other clauses must, then, have been designed, and must have been intended as a denial of such power.

Are Senators prepared to adopt the broad proposition upon which the Supreme Court rested and were obliged to rest the assertion of the power to legislate on the extradition of fugitives, namely, that wherever the Constitution confers a right or enjoins a duty, a power arises to the Federal Government to enforce the right or compel the performance of the duty? Are they prepared to carry this doctrine into its practical results? Is it not obvious that it will open a new and very copious source of powers to the General Government; and that it must tend to the subversion of the rights of the States and the establishment of a consolidated central power, dangerous to their independence and sovereignty?

I have said, Mr. President, that the several clauses providing for the extradition of fugitives from justice, and fugitives from service, and for the security in all the States of the rights of the citizens of each State, are in the nature of treaty stipulations, to be carried into effect by the appropriate action of the State governments. What that action should be is for the State governments to determine. It is for them to ascertain the true import of the terms of the compact, and to provide for its execution by such legislation as will guard equally the just rights of all parties. But, sir, those States who claim the performance of the compact from their sister States must see to it that they perform it themselves. A State which imprisons, without pretence of crime, the citizens of another State cannot demand, with a good grace, the surrender of fugitives.

But, sir, if it be granted that Congress has the power to legislate, are we bound to exercise it? We have power, without question, to enact a bankrupt law, but no one proposes such a law; and, if proposed, no one would feel obliged to vote for it, merely because we have power to enact it. We have power to declare war, but to declare war without just cause, would be, not a duty, but a crime. The power to provide by law for the extradition of fugitives is not conferred by any express grant. We have it, if we have it at all, as an implied power; and the implication which gives it to us, is, to say the least, remote and doubtful. We are not bound to exercise it. We are bound, indeed, not to exercise it, unless with great caution, and with careful regard, not merely to the alleged right sought to be secured, but to every other right which may be affected by it. Were the power as clear as the power to coin money or regulate commerce, still it should not be exercised to the prejudice of any right which the Constitution guaranties. We are not prepared, I hope, and I trust we never shall be prepared, to give the sanction of the American Senate to the bill and the amendments now upon our table—a bill which authorizes and requires the appointment of two hundred and sixty-one commissioners, and an indefinite number of other officers, to catch runaway slaves in the State of Ohio; which punishes humanity as a crime; which authorizes seizure without process, trial without a jury, and consignment to Slavery beyond the limits of the State without opportunity of defence, and upon *ex parte* testimony. Certainly no such bill can receive my vote.

It is further proposed, Mr. President, by the Senator from Kentucky, to establish governments for the territories acquired from Mexico, without any prohibition of Slavery. He proposes also to declare by resolution that Slavery does not LOW exist in those territories, and is not likely to be introduced into them.

Mr. President, no question has been more discussed of late years than this of the territorial prohibition of Slavery. Upon the rostrum, in legislative halls, in the street, by the fireside, everywhere, it has been a topic of debate, appeal, and conversation. From the moment that it became evident that the Mexican war must result in vast accessions of domain, an earnest desire, which soon matured into fixed determination, was manifested by a large majority of the American people that Slavery should be forever excluded from the new acquisitions. It was honorable to the northern Democracy that the first proposition to impress forever, upon the soil of the new territory, the signature and seal of freedom, came from a northern Democrat, distinguished for fidelity to Democratic principles, and was received with favor by the great body of his political associates. It was equally honorable to northern Whigs that they were not deterred by its Democratic origin from giving to the Proviso of Freedom a generous and general support. It was a revival, after the lapse of sixty-two years, of the territorial policy of Jefferson, and, however it may now serve particular ends to depreciate or deride it, the country will at last do justice to the measure and its author.

During the last Presidential canvass, it was hard to find in the free States an opponent of Slavery prohibition. The people had considered the subject, and had made up their minds. There was no need, therefore, of argument to establish the correctness of the principle or the necessity of the measure. The only contest was upon the question, whose election was most certain to secure the exclusion of Slavery from the territories.

On the whig side, it was urged that the candidate of the Philadelphia Convention was, if not positively favorable to the proviso, at least pledged to leave the matter to Congress, free from Executive influence, and ready to approve it when enacted by that body. Great stress, therefore, was laid upon the selection of Representatives and Senators devoted to this great measure; and it was asserted that if a majority of the members of the House and a Vice President, holding the casting vote in this body, could be elected favorable to the proviso, the freedom of the territories would be secure.

It happened that the distinguished statesman who received the nomination of the Baltimore Convention for the Chief Magrstracy, had written a letter shortly before that event, in which he avowed a change of opinion in regard to the proviso, which had resulted in a conviction that Congress had no constitutional power to enact it. Notwithstanding this letter, many of his friends in the free States persisted in asserting that he would not, if elected, veto the proviso; many also insisted that he regarded Slavery as excluded from the territories by the Mexican laws still in force; while others maintained that he regarded Slavery as an institution of positive law, and Congress as constitutionally incompetent to enact such law, and held, therefore, that it was impossible for Slavery to get into the territories, whether Mexican law was in force or not. It was claimed accordingly with great confidence that, in the event of the election of that eminent citizen, Slavery would be as effectually excluded from the territories by the action of the Administration as it could possibly be by the proviso.

Not satisfied with the positions or the nominations of either of these candidates, a great body of Independent Democrats, Progressive Whigs, and Liberty men united upon a platform of Democratic principles and measures, under the banner of Free Democracy, in support of a Democratic statesman who had already been honored with the Chief Magistracy, and whose opposition to the extension of Slavery, and cordial approval of the great measure of prohibition which had received a sanction so unanimous from the people, was well known and undoubted.

Well, sir, professions of devotion to Free Soil principles, liberally and even prodigally made by the supporters of the Philadelphia and Baltimore nominees, reinforced by party discipline and party attachments, so far prevailed with the people that the nominee of the Free Democracy received only about three hundred thousand votes.

As between the other candidates, the argument addressed to the people by the friends of the Philadelphia nomination was in substance this: prohibition is essential to the certain exclusion of Slavery from the territories; if the Democratic candidate shall be elected, prohibition is impossible, for the veto will be used, if the Whig candidate shall be elected, prohibition is certain, provided you elect a Congress who will carry out your will; vote, therefore, for the Whig candidate.

This argument, doubtless, had its weight. At all events, the people acted upon the theory which it suggested. They did their part. They elected the Whig candidate. They instructed, through the State Legislatures, one half the Senators to vote for the great measure of prohibition; they elected a Vice President recommended to them as unequivocally and heartily in favor of it; and they placed in the House of Representatives a decided majority pledged to its support.

What then? We came here; and, sir, it does seem to me that when we get here we are apt to forget that there is a PEOPLE, and that we have CONSTITUENTS. We seem to be more desirous to reach results which will satisfy controlling influences here, than to meet the just expectations of those whose representatives we are. Why, sir, every one knows that at the commencement of this session, there was a decided and apparently fixed majority in the other branch of Congress, in favor of the proviso; find that in this Chamber half or nearly half of the members were instructed to vote for it. And yet now we are told, and told by Senators who but recently were foremost in zealous advocacy of this measure, that it is unnecessary, and offensive to the South, and should be abandoned. Plans of compromise and arrangement, every one of which involves the surrender of this great vital principle, are brought forward and urged upon us.

I do not understand, sir, how it is that a measure which fully harmonizes with the original policy and the early precedents of the Government, and which once received the unanimous sanction of the entire South, can now justly be regarded as offensive by that section of the country. If it was right and acceptable to abolish existing Slavery, and prohibit future Slavery in the Northwestern Territory in 1787, the prohibition of the extension of Slavery into the territory acquired from Mexico, where no slave now exists, cannot be just cause of offence in 1850. At all events, sir, we must do our duty. We should not, we must not, be moved from it by any appeal addressed to sympathy and not to judgment.

But we are told, also, that the proviso is unnecessary; and this, too, by the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, who, less than two years ago, without reservation or qualification, declared his full adhesion to its "whole doctrine." Then there was great danger, in his judgment, that Slavery would find entrance into the territories, if the Democratic candidate should be elected: for in that event prohibition would be out of the question. Now it is discovered that prohibition is unnecessary! Slavery is excluded—so the Senator informs us—from California and New Mexico "by the law of nature, of physical geography, the law of the formation of the earth." And he tells us he would "not take pains to re-affirm an ordinance of Nature, nor to re-enact the will of God."

I wish, Mr. President, that the honorable Senator had told us that in 1848. I wish that the people could then have heard something of this law of nature, of physical geography, of the formation of the earth, which makes the territories acquired from Mexico forever inaccessible to Slavery. I cannot help thinking that the result of the election would have been somewhat different if these views had been then understood to find favor with the supporters of the Philadelphia nomination.

Sir, this law of nature is not, I suppose, of recent origin. It existed in 1848, if it exists at all. The clear vision which can read it now, written so plainly in the formation of the earth—descending so visibly from the throne of God—discerned it, doubtless, then. Why was it not then announced?

I must be allowed to say, that in my judgment, there is a difference between the full and entire commitment to the "whole doctrine" of the proviso, which the Senator avowed in 1848, and his recent declaration that, in a bill for the government of New Mexico, a prohibition of Slavery would be "an entirely useless, and, in that connection, entirely senseless, proviso." Useless and senseless, because it would be a re-enactment of the will of God! Sir, I should like to know what laws we are to enact, if we are not to re-enact the will of God? There is another power: are *His* the laws which we should re-enact? Sir, all just legislation must be a re-enactment of the Divine will. The rights of human nature are not derived from human law. Men are "*created* equal;" they are *endowed* by their *Creator* with inalienable rights." Aggressions upon these rights are crimes. It is the duty of every legislatpre to frame all law with paramount regard to the prohibition of these aggressions, and the security of these rights.

But, sir, is it quite true that any law of physical geography will protect the new territories from the curse of Slavery? Peonism was there under Mexican law; and where there is compulsory servitude for debt, lifelong and inevitable, chattel-slavery is not far off, if the law will permit it. But if peonism were not there to warn us what may be expected if Slavery be not prohibited, could we, as rational legislators, find an excuse in the physical circumstances of the country for abandoning the proviso? It is said to be "Asiatic in formation and scenery." Are there no slaves in Asia? But the soil is cultivated by "irrigation." Well, sir, will the fact, if it be a fact that the sun shines from a cloudless sky, and waters to refresh the earth must be drawn from the streams which snow-capped hills supply, will this exclude Slavery? But the lands are poor. Sir, who knows that? Much of the vast region over which we are to extend territorial governments is wholly unexplored. In other parts there is, as everywhere else, good land and poor land. Certainly there are mines, and in no employment has slave labor been more commonly or more profitably used.

Let us take care that we do not deceive ourselves, or mislead others. Neither soil, nor climate, nor physical formation, nor degrees of latitude, will exclude Slavery from any country. Can any gentleman name a degree of latitude beyond which Slavery has not gone? or any description of country to which it has not, at some time, found access? It is acknowledged, and has been for years acknowledged, to be unprofitable in several of the existing States; and yet, no State, excepting New York and New Jersey, which obeyed the impulse of the Revolution and of its doctrines, has abolished Slavery since the organization of this Government. The truth is, that so long as a powerful and active political interest is concerned in the extension of Slavery into new territories, it is vain to look for its exclusion from them except by positive law. It has been repeatedly stated by gentlemen from the slave States, in the course of this debate, that nothing prevented slave emigration to California except the Anti-Slavery agitation, and the dread of the proviso.

Mr. President, there are some Senators who place no reliance on configuration, or climate, or other physical conditions for the exclusion of Slavery, but seem to rely with some degree of confidence on the Mexican law to secure that object. I do not concur in this reliance. The Mexican law remaining in force in the territories, should secure, in my judgment, the freedom of all the inhabitants at the date of acquisition. In my judgment, also, neither the Government of the United States, nor any territorial government is, or can be constitutionally authorized to institute Slavery, any more than a monarchy, or a national religion, or the inquisition. But, sir, I know very well that Mexican law can be changed as soon as a territorial legislature is established; and I know, also, that my view of the constitutional limitations upon the power of this Government and of territorial governments in respect to their competency to establish and maintain Slavery, is not acknowledged as correct by the statesmen and jurists of the slave States. Give me an administration of this Government fully imbued with this view—heartily favorable to the perpetuation and extension of human Freedom, and heartily opposed to the perpetuation and extension of human Slavery, and I would not ask for any legislative prohibition. The spirit of such an administration, the judicial action which it would secure, and, above all, the Constitution so interpreted and enforced, would be proviso enough.

But we have no such administration. On the contrary, we know that distinguished gentlemen, who are among its most prominent supporters, assert and insist that under the Constitution, and in virtue of its provision, the Government of the United States is as much bound to protect and maintain, within national territories, every slaveholding emigrant in the full possession, control, and disposal of his slaves, as it is to protect and maintain any other emigrant in the possession, control, and disposal of any species of property whatever. In this position leading gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber agree with them. In other words, they insist that, by the operation of the Constitution itself, Slavery became lawful in the territories from the date of the acquisition. There is a pretty general concurrence among Senators from the slave States of both political parties in this position. I should be glad to be assured that there are no Senators from the free States who concur in it. I regret that the Senator from Massachusetts, whom I am sorry not to see in his seat today, did not see fit, when he addressed the Senate lately, to state his views upon this subject. If I recollect aright, that distinguished Senator, when occupying another higher position in the Government, in a diplomatic despatch of great ability, maintained the doctrine that, under the Constitution of the United States, men might be held as property in American vessels upon the high seas, beyond the limits of any State, and this upon the ground that such vessels were to be regarded in the same light as national territory. If the honorable member does in fact hold this opinion, I do not see that he differs widely, or at all, as to this matter, from the Senator from Georgia, [Mr. Berrien,] or the Senator from Alabama, [Mr. King.] I need not say that I wholly dissent from it.

In the midst of this variety of opinion, and under the circumstances which surround us, when it is well known that nearly every Senator from the slave States insists that Slavery should be permitted in the territories, and most of them expect that, if permitted, Slavery will be introduced there, it seems to me worse than ordinary folly for those who really desire its exclusion to reject the simple, and obvious, and certain preventive of prohibition. That we have the power to prohibit is clear, if we have any power to legislate for the territories at all. That we have the power to legislate I shall not pause to argue. I know of but one Senator who denies it; and even that distinguished gentleman, [Mr. Cass,] though he cannot find power to establish territorial governments, declares himself ready to assume it, on the ground of necessity. If he is willing to assume that power, it is difficult to see why he should not be willing, in exercising that power, to establish governments upon principles which will secure to every individual under them the blessings of personal liberty. For myself I cannot doubt upon the subject. The power to provide governments for the territories, and to prescribe just limits to their action, is clearly given by the Constitution. It has been exercised under every Administration, and by nearly every Congress, since the organization of the Government. Whatever difference of opinion there may have been, as to the existence or limits of other powers, there has been very little as to this. The power to prohibit Slavery in the territories is, in my judgment, clear and indisputable; and the duty of exercising it is imperative and sacred.

But we are told that if Congress prohibit Slavery in the territories, or abolish Slavery and the slave trade in this district, or fail to provide adequate securites for the return of runaway slaves, the South will dissolve the Union! This cry, Mr. President, neither astonishes nor alarms me. I have never thought, nor do I now think, that any man should be deterred by it, from an honest, fearless discharge of his duty here. It is an old cry, not without profit to those who have used it. It was first heard in the Congress of 1774. The student of history who examines the Non-Importation and Non-Exportation Agreement of that Congress, will be struck by a singular exception in the Non-Exportation Article. I have already had occasion to remark that the Agreement itself was designed to secure a redress of American grievances from the Government of Great Britain by a suspension of commercial intercourse. The Non-Exportation Article bound the colonies and the people not to export any American commodity to Great Britain, Ireland, or the West Indies, with this remarkable qualification, "except rice, to Europe." How came this exception there? Why, sir, the staple of South Carolina was rice, and the delegates of South Carolina in that first Congress when the struggle with Great Britain was impending, and union was all-important to its successful issue, threatened to withdraw from the Congress and break up the Association, unless South Carolina could be permitted to export rice and indigo. This proceeding occasioned a suspension of the business of the Congress for two or three days. Finally it was determined to complete the Association without conceding the South Carolina demand, and thereupon her delegates, except one, withdrew. They were invited to return, and a compromise was proposed, to allow the exportation of rice, but not of indigo. I have consulted Pitkin's statistics, and I find that the exportation of rice in 1770 was about one hundred and sixty thousand barrels, valued at $1,530,000. I find no mention of indigo. Of course the compromise was agreed to, and the words "except rice to Europe" added to the Non-Exportation Article. It was a model for all future compromises. South Carolina got what was substantive, and surrendered what was unimportant. This was the first utterance of the disunion cry, and this was its first result.*

The Journals of the old Congres inform us that in 1783 a resolution was adopted, establishing the seat of Government at the Falls of the Delaware. Much dissatisfaction was manifested by the South. Some persons, it seems, became alarmed, and a motion was made to re-consider, in order to fix on some place more "*favorable to the Union*," and approaching "nearer to that justice which is due to the southern States."† All this terminated in another compromise. It was agreed that two seats of Government should be established—one on the Delawere, and the other on the Potomac. The final result was the establishment, by the action of Congress under the Constitution, of the seat of Government in this District, and the abandonment of the location originally agreed on.

In the Convention which framed the Constitution the same cry was heard. South Carolina and Georgia declared they could not come into the Union unless they could have the privilege of importing slaves.‡ And, notwithstanding the sense of the Convention was strong and almost unanimous against the traffic, for the sake of the Union another compromise was agreed on. Slavery was allowed all it demanded for twenty years; after which, Congress might suppress the trade if it should see fit.

In 1820 the Union was again menaced. The cry now was, "admit Missouri as a slave State, or we will dissolve the Union." Great alarm was excited. Propositions for compromise were multiplied, and the contest finally terminated, as usual, by conceding to Slavery all it then demanded, with a set-off to freedom in the prohibition of Slavery in all the territory acquired from France north of 36 deg. 30 min., except that within the limits of the new State.

The same play was enacted in 1832 and 1833. Then the ground of complaint was the tariff. South Carolina pushed her disunion remedy to nullification. General Jackson was at the head of the Government, unterrified. But in Congress great apprehension was manifested, and a desire to concede almost everything rather than to risk the consequences of a decided course. Another compromise was effected. The protective policy was abandoned by its great champion, and a scale of reduction of duties adopted, which in ten years overthrew the Tariff. For one, Mr. President, I do not complain of the reduction of duties; but I would prefer to see a plan of reduction adopted calmly, considerately, not under the dictation of any cry, but in conformity with a sound and liberal judgment.

Well, sir, between 1830 and 1835, the Anti-Slavery agitation commenced, and soon became formidable. Then again we heard the cry of disunion. The demand now was the suppression of the freedom of speech and the press, and of the right of petition; in brief, silence on the subject of Slavery, and forbearance of all action against it. The alternative denounced was dissolution of the Union. The agitation, however, was not suppressed; Anti-Slavery societies increased and multiplied; they made themselves felt everywhere. Well, was the Union dissolved? Not at all. It stands yet, and will stand, I trust, forever. The menace was as earnest, as emphatic, as violent as ever, but it came to nothing. It had the same termination which would have attended all similar preceding menaces, had they been calmly disregarded.

In 1844 the annexation of Texas was demanded by the slave States. It had been a favorite object for many years, and it seemed brought within their grasp. They became, accordingly, extremely urgent and resorted to the South Carolina specific. They

*Am. Arch. 4th Ser., vol. 1, page 1111.
†4 Jour. Cong. Confed., 288.
‡3 Mad. Pap., 1589.

raised the cry "Texas or disunion." The distinguished Senator from Missouri, always devoted to the Union, took the trouble to direct public attention, in an appendix to a speech of his on the subject of Texas, delivered in that year, to some samples of these threats. They are worth looking at now. Well, sir, under these influences, in part, Texas was brought into the Union. I say, "in part," because I am well aware that other influences contributed largely to the result; and among these influences not the least powerful was a generous sentiment of the Democracy of the country in favor of the extension of the American Union—a sentiment which made them willing to accept Texas with Slavery and trust to the future for her deliverance from that evil and reproach.

And now, sir, we have the last republication of this old story. Now we are threatened with dissolution of the Union unless we will consent to what no republican Government ever did consent to: what is in direct opposition to the principles and spirit of our institutions, and is condemned by the earliest and best precedents of our history: namely, the extension of Slavery into territories now free! Shall we yield to this outcry? For one, I say, never! In my judgment, it is time to pause. We have yielded point after point: we have crowded concession on concession, until duty, honor, patriotism, shame, demands that we should stop.

But we are told, almost with the tone of taunt, that the free States have had the majority all this time in one branch of Congress at least, and in the electoral college, and, therefore, that whatever responsibility there may have been in making these concessions to Slavery, it is upon them. It is well to remind us of this. The free States have had the majority; and the victories of Slavery have been won by their divisions. John Randolph said, long ago, "We of the South are always united and can always unite; while you of the North divide. We have conquered you once, and we can and we will conquer you again." These two sentiments make a history.

I do not say, and I do not mean to say, that there has been but one political party in the slave States: but that, in these States, fidelity to the interests of Slavery, has always been, in both parties, an indispensable condition of support for high public station; and that great numbers, in either party, have always been ready to support a candidate of opposite general politics, if undoubted on this question, rather than a candidate of like general politics at all suspected of disfavor to Slavery. No candidate known to be in favor of placing the legitimate influence of this Government actively, and decidedly on the side of freedom, could receive the support of either party. It is by this unity of sentiment and purpose, aided by appeals to groundless fears for the safety of the Union, and by a disposition growing out of these fears and party alliances to submit to the tests imposed by the slaveholding sections of each political party, that the slave States have "conquered."

Mr. DAWSON.—While the Senator is writing the history of the times, I trust he will do it correctly. The South has never opposed any man because he was in favor of freedom. The South has selected between gentlemen, and those who were against interfering with the constitutional rights of the South have always been supported by them. They have never opposed any man on the ground merely that he was in favor of freedom. Not so. They are opposed to interference with their constitutional rights only; and the Senator is wrong to say that they opposed any one because he belongs to the free States, or is in favor of freedom.

Mr. CHASE.—I shall always be ready to accept any correction from any Senator, of any erroneous statement I may make. But, sir, what is meant by the "constitutional rights of the South?" Who refuses to support "the constitutional rights of the South?" Nobody here, certainly. But what are they? Sir, when gentlemen from the slave States ask us to support the Constitution, I fear they mean only their *construction* of the Constitution. Every concession which has ever been made to Slavery, every concession now demanded, is claimed under this same plea of "constitutional rights." I will ask the Senator from Georgia whether he does not hold that it is the "constitutional right" of every citizen of the slave States to take his slaves into the territories, and to be protected in holding them there by the laws of this Government?

Mr. DAWSON.—I do.

Mr. CHASE.—So I supposed. Such, also, I understand to be the opinion of the Senator from Alabama, [Mr. King,] whose abilities and virtues command such general respect. He holds, if I understand aright some recent remarks of his, that the General Government is bound by the Constitution to recognize and protect the rights of masters in slaves to the same extent and in the same manner as the rights of owners in any description of property whatever. I would inquire of the Senator if I understand him correctly?

Mr. KING.—I was not paying particular attention to the Senator, and therefore do not precisely understand, even now, the question. I will endeavor to answer it if he will repeat it.

Mr. CHASE.—I inquired of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Dawson] whether, in his judgment, a citizen of a slave State, taking slaves with him and emigrating into the territories acquired from Mexico, would be entitled, under the Constitution, to the recognition and protection of his claim of property in slaves by the legislation of this Government, precisely as he would be to the recognition and protection of his rights as owner of property of any description? The Senator replied in the affirmative. I then added that I believed the Senator from Alabama entertained the same opinion.

Mr. KING.—The opinion I entertain is this: that in every territory acquired by the United States, either by conquest or by purchase, every citizen of every State in the Union is entitled to participate. With regard to taking slaves there, they can be protected under any government that may be formed for the territories by the United States. The power to form such governments is supposed to exist under the Constitution. Whether it does or not, such has been the practice and the construction given to it. When a territorial government is established, it is only for the protection of persons and property and the preservation of order, and it has no power whatever to legislate for the destruction of property. That is my opinion. I believe that whenever a territorial government is established, if persons holding slaves think proper to go there with them, this Government is bound to protect them until the period arrives when the population is sufficient for the formation of a State Constitution. Then, we of the South hold, I believe without exception, that the people thus forming a State constitution, have a right to prohibit or to permit Slavery at their pleasure, and that Congress has no right to prevent the new State from coming into the Union on that ground, but can only look at its constitution to ascertain whether it is republican in its character. Am I understood?

Mr. CHASE.—Fully. The doctrine of the Senator is precisely that of the Senator from Georgia. We understand now, from both sides of this Chamber, what is meant when we are called on to maintain "the constitutional rights of the South." So far as the masters now under discussion are concerned, it means that we must recognize and maintain by legislation the claim of citizens of the slave States to take slaves into the territories and hold them there, as property, under national government, and territorial government until the territory becomes a State, and then we are bound to admit the State into the Union with a constitution establishing Slavery, if such should be the constitution adopted. And no citizen who refuses his assent to this doctrine; who believes that this Government of ours cannot, under the Constitution, sustain any claim of property in slaves beyond State limits; who opposes, openly and decidedly, the extension of Slavery into the territories, can receive the support of either political party in the slave States. Both parties agree in establishing the test.

Mr. BUTLER.—I would ask the Senator if he repudiates or adopts the doctrine laid down by Mr. Webster in his celebrated letter to Lord Ashburton, in which he said that slave property in vessels assimilated to that property in territories, and that the Government was equally bound to protect it?

Mr. CHASE.—I have already said, Mr. President, that I do not at all concur in that doctrine.

Mr. DAWSON.—The Senator has made an exposition of the mode and manner in which the South vote. I wish to ask him if, with one or two exceptions, every Southern State did not stand by Mr. Van Buren for the Presidency—the very candidate for whom the Senator voted at the last Presidential election? So that history is against the position which the Senator occupies, and the South has only done that which the Senator himself has done.

Mr. CHASE.—"Circumstances," it is said, "alter cases." [Laughter.] I rather think that Mr. Van Buren, occupying the position and avowing the sentiments he did in 1848, would not have been a very acceptable candidate to our southern friends, however nominated. At any rate I believe it so happened that he received not more than five hundred votes, if so many, in all the slave States.

Mr. DAWSON.—The party had another candidate.

Mr. CHASE.—And another platform. And I am inclined to think, the objection of the slave States was quite as much to our platform as our candidate.

Mr. President, disguise is vain. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the test I have referred to is made. It is stamped upon every page of our political history for fifty years. Let the test be made, if gentlemen desire. I only say, for one, that I will not submit to it.

Let us understand each other. Let us cease from endeavoring to agree in the support of the same candidate upon opposite grounds. Let us have political platforms, which will have the same meaning in Georgia as in Maine, and candidates who cannot be represented in the North as in favor of freedom, and in the South as supporters of Slavery. The policy of silence with reference to important measures and principles, and the policy of ambiguous expressions, are equally obnoxious. Both mislead public judgment; and whether the party which adopts the former, or the party which adopts the latter, succeeds, one or the other section of the country must be disappointed.

Mr. President, honesty is the best policy; justice, the highest expediency; and principle, the only proper basis of union in a political organization. Holding fast as I do to Democratic principles: believing firmly that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights to life and liberty, I desire to see those principles carried out boldly, earnestly, resolutely, in the practical administration of affairs. I wish to see the powers of this Government exercised for the great objects which the Constitution indicates; for the perfection of our Union; for the establishment of justice; for the common defence; for the security of liberty. At the same time I do not desire to see this Government, under the influence of any zeal, however honorable, for freedom, transcend at all the sphere of its constitutional powers and duties.—While, therefore, I shall steadily support all proper legislation for the establishment and security of freedom in the territories and elsewhere within the sphere of exclusive national jurisdiction, I shall, as steadily, refuse my support to all legislation on the subject of Slavery within the States. In this line of action I shall feel myself supported by the precepts of the sages of the revolutionary era, by the example of the founders of the Republic, by the original policy of the Government, and by the principles of the Constitution.

I cannot believe that there is danger in such a course. Least of all does the stale cry of disunion alarm me. Men, generally, adapt remedies to evils. But what evil that the slave States complain of will disunion cure? Will it establish Slavery in the territories? Will it procure the return of fugitives? Will it suppress discussion? Will it secure Slavery where it is? Sir, all men must see that disunion is no remedy for the slave States. Why then the cry, if not to alarm the timid, the sensitive, the unreflecting—to afford excuses for concession—and thus secure advantages which the sober judgment and enlightened conscience of the country would never yield?

Mr. President, I have never calculated the value of the Union. I know no arithmetic by which the computation can be made. We of the West are in the habit of looking upon the Union as we look upon the arch of heaven, without a thought that it can ever decay or fall. With equal reverence we regard the great ordinance of Freedom, under whose benign influence, within little more than half a century, a wilderness has been converted into an empire. Ohio, the eldest born of the Constitution and the Ordinance, cleaves and will cleave faithfully to both. And now that the time has come when vast accessions of free territory demand the application of those principles of the Ordinance, to which she is indebted for her prosperity and power, to guard them against the blighting influence of Slavery, she will insist that the same protection shall be extended to the territories which was extended to her.

Nor are these the sentiments of Ohio alone. They are the sentiments of the people throughout the free States. Here and there the arts or the fears of politicians or capitalists may suppress their utterance; but they live, and will live, in the hearts of the masses. There is no great real change in those opinions and convictions which placed a majority pledged to free soil in the other wing of the Capitol. It may be, however, that you will succeed here in sacrificing the claims of freedom by some settlement carried through the forms of legislation. But the people will unsettle your settlement. It may be that you will determine that the territories shall not be secured by law against the ingress of Slavery. The people will reverse your determination. It may be that you will succeed in burying the Ordinance of Freedom. But the people will write upon its tomb, *Resurgam;* and the same history which records its resurrection may also inform posterity that they who fancied they had killed the proviso, only committed political suicide.

"I shall rise again."

A FINAL REJOINDER.

To the Editor of the Boston Transcript:

SIR—A few words in reply to the communication of 'SIGMA,' in your paper of last evening, and I leave him to his chosen work of personal defamation, without further notice. His private opinion of me, whether favorable or unfavorable, is the last thing for solicitude on my part; because he who is ungovernable in temper and scurrilous in controversy, whatever may be his ability, is neither to be courted nor feared. The only inducements I had to notice his unjust and unmanly assault, (all the more unmanly because it was made anonymously,) were, its connection with the late pro-slavery riots in New York, its tendency and apparent design to excite similar disturbances in this city during the approaching anniversary week, and the opportunity it afforded me to correct certain wilful mis-statements respecting the speech I delivered in the Broadway Tabernacle, to which a hundred hostile presses are giving a wide circulation.

The charge that 'Sigma' brought against me was, that, here and elsewhere, upon various occasions, I had 'discharged upon the community, impudent, disgusting, audacious and abominable blasphemy,' and ought to be indicted under a statute of this Commonwealth! My reply to this was—'For more than twenty years I have been before the public as a writer and a lecturer; and during all that time, I challenge 'Sigma' to produce anything from my pen or lips irreverent towards God, derogatory to the character of Jesus, or hostile to pure and undefiled religion.' How does he attempt to substantiate his charge? By *repeating the act*, of which I complained as unfair and dastardly in the extreme—viz., taking a garbled report of my New York speech from a paper intensely hostile to the speaker, and, assuming it to be authentic, making it the occasion of scattering in this community the most unjust and inflammatory comments upon it"! He finds that report in the Boston *Daily Advertiser*, a paper notoriously inimical to the Anti-Slavery movement, as copied from the New York *Commercial Advertiser*, a paper still more bitter and malevolent in its opposition; and by such witnesses he coolly declares 'its authenticity is established'—especially as the editor of the latter journal says he was present at the meeting, and, consequently, able [yes, able, but utterly indisposed] to give a correct account of the scenes enacted there! Effrontery, like this, has seldom its parallel.

Now I assert, once more—that report is a malicious caricature, as every one who heard my remarks, possessing the least candor or regard for truth, will bear witness. I will refer to only two or three points.

1. I am represented to have said, 'There could be no piety in the Romish Church.' This I did not say—this I do not believe. I said of that Church, as such, that inasmuch as it sanctions slaveholding and slavebreeding on the part of its priesthood and lay members, in this country, the slave could not look to it for deliverance from his chains. I said the same thing of the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist and Methodist churches. Now, if the charge against these Churches is true, (and not even 'Sigma' has the hardihood to deny it,) is not the inference one of common sense? Are we—for example—to look for those in Europe who are monarchists in principle and practice, and loud in their denunciations of democratic agitators, to subvert the monarchy which they are so zealous to perpetuate, and on its ruins to establish the republic which they so much dread? In former years, 'Sigma' was an able and faithful laborer in the unpopular cause of Temperance, and cared not who called him fanatical or irreverent. At that time, (I know not what he would say now,) if any one had declared that the Church would sanction moderate drinking and the traffic in ardent spirits was not to be relied on to promote teetotalism, I am quite sure he would have endorsed the declaration as a self-evident truth. This was 'the head and front of my offending' at New York. 'What blasphemy!'

2. I am reported to have said, comprehensively, 'The Churches had no piety,—i.e. had no members connected with them who were truly pious.' I said nothing of the kind. I merely referred to their pro-slavery features as organized bodies.

3. I am accused of having 'attacked the inspiration of the Bible.' This is utterly false, whatever may be my views of the popular notion of inspiration. But on what is this accusation based? Mark!—'The question of inspiration, he said, was worth nothing'—nothing as a test of vital piety, I added—'in this age.' And what is it worth? A hundred conflicting sects believe in the inspiration of the Bible, but to what purpose? Further—'The greatest amount of immorality was compatible with the highest degree of veneration' for the book. Is not this true? 'The Bible has become the most popular book in America.' Was this to assert it? What other book is so revered, or so highly eulogized, or so systematically and gratuitously circulated? Did I refer to this fact reproachfully or complainingly? No! but only to remind all who heard me, that it was not difficult to believe in a fashionable book, and faith in the Bible [i. e. assent to the doctrine of its inspiration] was no clue to moral conduct. Is it? I said, moreover, that every Protestant claimed the right of private judgment as to what inspiration is, and what the Bible teaches; and, therefore, though a person says he believes in its being inspired, and in obeying its injunctions, in the last analysis it is only *his opinion* on these points that is obtained, and not absolutely what is inspiration or the book itself; and the question still remains open, 'What is inspiration? What is it that the Bible requires?' Is this to be guilty of irreverence, or only of uttering a truism?

4. I am reported to have said, 'Jesus is become obsolete'—but what I added is maliciously suppressed by the editor of the *Commercial Advertiser*—'obsolete as a test of loyalty to God or love to man, because nothing is more common or more respectable than a profession of faith in him as a Savior; whereas in primitive times nothing was more odious or more perilous than such a profession, and then it was a searching test.'

'Then to side with Truth is noble when we share her wretched crust,
Ere her cause bring fame and profit, and 'tis prosperous to be just;
Then it is the brave man chooses, while the coward stands aside.
Doubting in his abject spirit till his Lord is crucified,
And the multitude make virtue of the faith they had denied.'

5. I am reported to have said, 'Jesus believes in war, and in giving the Mexican's hell.' This is a gross misrepresentation, as it stands. After saying that Jesus, is a historical personage, is everywhere honored and believed on among us, I added that, in the person of Zachary Taylor, he occupies the Presidential chair; for President Taylor professes to believe in Jesus, but *in a Jesus who enslaves human beings, and hands them over to him for a possession*—yes, in a Jesus who is for 'giving the Mexicans hell'—quoting the language so frequently alleged to have been uttered on the battle-field in Mexico by this military chieftain. Here, according to the *Commercial Advertiser*, (for the hit was palpable,) 'some one in the audience, unable longer to control his emotions, called out, "This cannot be tolerated!" and considerable excitement prevailed all over the house.' It was that most abandoned of men, Isaih Rynders, who made that exclamation, and, with his ruffian confederates at his heels, rushed down upon the platform with horrid oaths and imprecations, threatening to knock down the speaker; thus confirming every word I had said respecting the popular religion of this nation, and its slaveholding, blood-stained President! So much for my 'sickening and disgusting blasphemies' on that occasion!

6. 'Sigma' says, 'It appears that Mr. Garrison *permitted* any one to pray that felt it to be of any use.'—It was not merely a permission, but an *invitation* that was given, and in these words:—'If any person present feels moved to offer vocal prayer to the God of the oppressed, an opportunity is now given for that purpose.' This has been the uniform practice of the American Anti-Slavery Society since its organization, in the true spirit of religious liberty,—thus giving no offence to the peculiar notions of any one, and avoiding a purely ceremonial observance. And this is deemed worthy of a sneer!

7. 'Mr. Garrison read passages from the Bible, *which*, he said, *some persons considered to be the word of God.*' Surely, to make such a declaration was not 'blasphemy,'—nay, was strictly in accordance with truth. Surely, to read those passages was not an immorality! Yet my language is so represented and italicised as to imply that I spoke in a sarcastic manner; whereas what I said was this'—'I will now read select portions of the Scriptures, *which the people of this country profess to receive as the word of God.*' This I said seriously and emphatically, for the purpose of deeping the impression upon the assembly in reading those thrilling rebukes and warnings of the prophets, relating to the oppression of the poor and needy.

I said no more in derogation of the popular religious observances of the day, than Isaiah uttered against such in his times, when he declared—'To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations: incense is an abomination unto me; the new moon and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with: *it is iniquity*, EVEN THE SOLEMN MEETING. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear.' My reasons for condemning such observances as worthless and hypocritical are precisely those which the prophet gave for his blasphemous conduct:—'Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil doers! Your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgement, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.' And now, Mr. Editor, let me state an edifying fact.

The speech at New York, which has been so basely misrepresented, was not a new one for the occasion, but was one that I had previously delivered, verbatim, in Plymouth, Weymouth, Abington, South Hingham, (on Sunday, in the Congregational meeting-house, at a regular church service, in the pulpit,) Salem, Portsmouth, Portland, and in various other places, (at greater length, it is true,) to large, attentive, and deeply interested audiences, composed of persons of conflicting religious and political opinions; in every instance apparently to great acceptance, and always impressively. Nothing was further from me than any thought or intention to create unnecessary excitement by repeating that speech at New York—the sole design of which was strictly philosophical, viz: to demonstrate how old tests, which were vital in one age, become powerless in another; how forms of iniquity change, bringing new circumstances, affecting other people, prevailing in other times, and requiring other tests of religious fidelity in their extirpation: how, to sum it all up in the very truthful and graphic verse of one of our most gifted poets—

Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of Truth and Falsehood, for the good or evil side;
Some Great Cause, God's NEW MESSIAH, offering each the bloom or blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand and the sheep upon the right,
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that light!'

Nothing can be a wider departure from the truth, than the representation, that it was my speech that led to the riotous outbreaks in New York. I happened to be the first speaker, and in the audience was a band of ruffians lying in wait to make me, or any other speaker, 'an offender for a word'—who came predetermined to break up the meeting—stimulated by the inflammatory and murderous appeals of such infamous journals as Bennett's *Herald* and the *New York Globe*, and having their reward. I utter no unmanly cries—I shrink from no just responsibility: but I have a right to protest against the foulest treatment and the most atrocious misrepresentations.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

A correspondent of the *Tribune* writing from Richmond, Va., relates the following incidents as illustrative of Slavery in that State.

As I was conversing with some Southerners in Washington upon Free Soil, they expressed a desire that I should go South and see Slavery as it exists there, and I would come back freed of all Free Soil notions. One from Florida was particularly anxious that I should go home with him and he would show me a tame alligator, nine feet long, that he fed on terrapins and dead niggers. "Never costs me anything to bury a dead nigger," said he. I resolved to go as far South as this place, to see if there was so much difference between the practice and theory of Slavery. As I sallied forth this morning to see the place, almost the first thing that met my view was a large house, surrounded by a very high brick wall. Upon asking the first passer by what it was, he informed me that it was a nigger jail, where the traders confined their slaves, preparatory to taking them South. He very politely offered to conduct me through it, which I gladly accepted. I have heretofore supposed that the term "Slavery in chains," as used in the newspapers, was a figure of speech, used comparatively. But here they were actually manacled, their feet chained together, sitting around on benches in the most filthy and loathesome place I ever saw. I questioned one as to why he was chained. He said he had been sold to go South, and he wanted to see his wife again before he went, and had run away to go back to his old master's for that purpose. My heart was too full to question any of the others.

In the female department there was a very pretty white woman with two children. By close inspection it might be seen that she had a little African blood in her veins, apparently not over one tenth, but the children did not show the least trace of it. I expressed surprise at this to my conductor, as I had supposed Slavery to be confined to the African race, when I was informed that there was no limit of blood in this State. So long as the mother is a slave, the offspring is also, no matter of what color. I have since learned that there are numerous slaves in this city as white as their masters.

My next move was to attend a slave auction. The slaves of all colors, from sooty black to perfect white, were brought in and seated on benches. Here they were subjected to a most particular examination. It was curious to see the manner of the speculators in examining their teeth. They would order them to open their mouth, then press back their lips with their own thumbs, just as a jockey would examine a horse. On a window-sill lay a large pile of manacles, some were constructed of a large rod of iron with handcuffs on each side, so as to form a row. The first lot sold was the white woman and her two children, that I before spoke of. The auctioneer extolled her qualities by representing her to be a first rate seamstress, &c. She was struck down at $1,105.

The lackey of the place (himself a Slave) then leads up a man about 25: "unharness yourself old Boy," says he. The man trembling like a leaf all the while, strips himself, with the assistance of the lackey, in full view of the street and of the female slaves. The lackey asks him what he is shaking for? as he is not going to be hurt. The auctioneer announces no scars on his back of any consequence, and the sale proceeds; sold at $455. Next comes a little girl of 13, about half white. The two twin brothers of 14, sold to different masters, one I was told to a Southern Trader, and so on to the end of the sale, when the gentlemen were thanked for their attention, and their attendance requested to-morrow, when they they would be shown something nice. During the sale my attention was called to the door by a string of slaves going past, chained together, probably on their way to some Southern plantation:

Altogether, this was the most heart-sickening sight I ever saw. I involuntarily exclaimed: "Is it possible that this is permitted in my own native country—the country I have loved so well, and whose institutions I have exultingly pointed to as an example for the world?"

I am confident that the most effective way for Abolitionists to gain converts to their cause is to send Northerners as far South as this place, and let them attend one of these slave auctions. Hard, indeed, must be the heart of one who could look upon such a scene and not blush for his country's shame. I remonstrated with some of the inhabitants for permitting such a thing among them. They all have the Bible and Christianity at their tongues' end, and are ready to point out passages to justify it and show that it is a God-ordained institution. "If this is Christianity," I replied' "don't call me a Christian."

A. S. W.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1850.

New England Anti-Slavery Convention.

This Convention assembled in the Melodeon in Boston, Tuesday forenoon, May 28, and at 10 o'clock was called to order by Francis Jackson.

Messrs. Samuel May, Jr., of Boston, William Jenkins, of Andover, Samuel Dyer, of Abington, Jonathan Walker, of Plymouth, and Daniel S. Whitney, of Beverly, were appointed a committee to report a list of officers.

Opportunity was given for prayer.

The committee reported the following list:

President—FRANCIS JACKSON, of Boston.

Vice Presidents—Edmund Quincy, Adin Ballou, of Milford, James W. Walker, of Ohio, George Doughty, of New York, and Bourne Spooner.

Secretaries—Samuel May, Jr., Elbridge Sprague, of Abington, and Eliza J. Kenney, of Salem,

Committee of Business—W. L. Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Anne Warren Weston, Parker Pillsbury, Henry C. Wright, Stephen S. Foster, Abby Kelley Foster, and Lucy Stone.

Committee on Finance—Samuel Brooke, Lewis Ford, Nathaniel B. Spooner, Joshua T. Everett; with power to add to their number.

The Rev. Hiram Wilson, of Dawn, Canada West, well known for his devotion to the education and relief of the fugitive slaves in Canada addressed the Convention. He said the number of fugitives there was about twenty thousand; they are of all ages and capacities, men and women on whom the corrupting and imbruting influences of Slavery had been doing their work all their lives. It is not surprising that some of them should be, not ignorant only, but indolent and even vicious; but a very large share are a respectable and worthy people, given to industry, sustaining schools for their children, and maintaining their families comfortably.

W. L. GARRISON, from the Committee on Business, reported the following Resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, (in the language of Daniel O'Connell,) That, 'of all men living, an American citizen who is the owner of slaves is the most despicable; he is a political hypocrite of the very worst description.'

2. *Resolved*, (in the language of Lord Brougham,) That, 'while men despise fraud, and loathe rapine, and abhor blood, they will reject with indignation the wild and guilty phantasy, that man can hold property in man.'

3. *Resolved*, (in the language of John Wesley,) That, 'Slavery is the sum of all villanies, and American Slavery the vilest that ever saw the sun.'

4. *Resolved*, (in the language of the Rev. Albert Barnes,) That, 'there is no power out of the church that could sustain Slavery an hour, if it were not sustained in it.'

5. *Resolved*, That the criminality of the Abolitionists consists, not in the severity, but the justness of their language; not in the falseness, but the truthfulness of their accusations; not in the unsoundness, but the purity of their principles; not in the rashness, but the wise adaptation of their measures to the glorious end they have in view; and they are hated, persecuted and traduced, solely because they plead for justice to a despised and persecuted race; because they will not compromise with sin, nor go with the multitude to do evil; because they maintain that whatever arrays itself against human liberty is not of God; and because they declare that a religion which is stained with pollution and blood, though called by the name of Christ, is to be repudiated with indignation and abhorrence.

6. *Resolved*, That he who professes to admire the Declaration of Independence, and to revere the memories of its signers, and at the same time appeals to the Bible, as the inspired word of God, in support of the rectitude of enslaving human beings, proves himself as unprincipled as the highwayman who pretends to regard honesty as of paramount obligation.

7. *Resolved*, That they who reproach the Abolitionist for not so speaking against an all-pervading, all-powerful national sin as to give no offence; for not so contending with atrocious tyranny as not to excite the displeasure of the tyrant; for not so managing their cause as to create no alarm and cause no agitation; for not so making their accusations and uttering their rebukes as to avoid all personal imputations; for not so consulting a prudent and judicious policy as to avoid all misrepresentation, reproach and persecution, do exhibit great ignorance, folly and assurance, in requiring what is a moral impossibility, and pour contempt on the memories of the prophets, of Christ and his apostles, of reformers and martyrs in all ages of the world.

8. *Resolved*, That while the general community may naturally view the recent conduct of Daniel Webster with profound sadness and profound surprise, since the opportunity which the labors of others had gained for him was such as no man in this country ever before enjoyed, and the good which one bold word from his lips, in behalf of justice and humanity, would have done is incalculable; still, since the best service an influential man can do a good cause is to give it his hearty support, the next best always is, that he should openly oppose it, we feel that the cause of Freedom owes Mr. Webster thanks at least for the frankness of his treachery and the openness of his opposition.

9. *Resolved*, That the recent course of Mr. Webster is no matter of surprise to us, since we have always found him, as to our question, silent when he ought to speak, speaking when he ought to act, and forgetful of every pledge precisely at that moment when the promised duty was, if ever, to be performed; with him it is a matter of course to thunder pledges at Springfield which he dares not fulfil at Washington, to omit to say at Washington, what he dare not omit printing at Boston, to have a desk as full of amendments unoffered as his life is of pledges unredeemed, and, *ignis fatuus* like, to lead his too credulous retainers into the fullest endorsement of the worst of measures, and then slip his own neck free by charging mistakes upon the reporters—that as to all such trifles he may fairly argue that the community have no right to be surprised, since habit is a second nature, and rarely in his life has 'the rigor of war come up to that lofty and sounding phrase of the manifesto'—and that it is enough for him to claim a royal prototype in that Charles,

'Whose word no man relied on,
Who never said a foolish thing,
And never did a wise one!'

10. *Resolved*, That in the letter of Daniel Webster, just published in reply to certain endorsers of his evil course on the subject of Slavery at Newburyport, we rejoice in the clear and strong manifestations it gives that he is stung to the quick by the moral reprobation which has followed his recent infamous speech in the Senate—that he feels the necessity of defending himself against the impeachment of those whom he grossly slanders and affects to despise;—while we are shocked at the cool audacity, the utter destitution of moral principle and of every spark of humanity, which he continues to exhibit, in maintaining it to be both the right and the duty of the people of the North to re-enslave every fugitive bondman among them, or who may hereafter stand on the soil, and to send them back to tortures and to a horrible doom.

11. *Resolved*, That in his scurrilous and malignant accusations against the Abolitionists, Daniel Webster not only exhibits the passion of a self-convicted traitor to liberty, but becomes the echo of those whose cry eighteen centuries ago was, 'Release not this man, but Barrabas! Away with him! Crucify him!'

G. W. F. MELLEN addressed the Convention. After proceeding some time, and being repeatedly called to order, he was declared by the President to be out of order. He appealed to the Convention which nearly unanimously sustained the decision of the Chair, and Mr. Mellen took his seat.

HENRY C. WRIGHT supported the first resolution.

Mr. SAYLES, of New York, pronounced Henry Clay and Daniel Webster *noble men*, and expressed his unbounded reverence for them both.

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH, of Connecticut, replied to the last speaker in a speech of close argument and great eloquence. He put some searching questions to Mr. S. as to what *he* would do, if a fugitive slave should implore his help, to which he gave no definite answer for a time, but at length replied that if the continuance of the Union was involved he would bolt his door against the fugitive; "I would do *anything*" said he, "to save the Union."

Adjourned to quarter before 3 o'clock.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON.

The Convention was called together at the hour to which adjourned by the President. The Secretary read the Resolutions.

JAMES W. WALKER, of Ohio, made an eloquent speech in their support.

Notice was given that the Finance Committee would proceed to the discharge of their duties.

HENRY C. WRIGHT supported the resolutions, expressing in a clear and strong manner his view that no authority, no government, no Book, no Bible, no God, can make Slavery right; and that whatever sanctions Slavery is to be rejected and abhorred. Being asked if he believed that the Bible sanctions Slavery, at the close of his speech he replied with an emphatic No.

PARKER PILLSBURY addressed the Convention, full of hope and encouragement in view of the auspicious signs of the times.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER, of Worcester, followed, saying that he could not answer the question addressed to Mr. Wright in as unqualified a manner as he. He thought there were parts of the Bible which sanctioned a certain kind of servitude and even oppression, and which taught other immoral and detestable practices. But with regard to other parts, in which he included the whole of the New Testament, he said he found there only the purest, most sublime and elevated morality.

Mr. CORDIS spoke in reply to the positions of Messrs. Wright and Foster.

Adj. to meet in Cochituate Hall at 7 1-2 o'clock; the Melodeon having been pre-engaged for a different purpose.

TUESDAY EVENING.

Cochituate Hall was crowded to an uncomfortable degree, at an early hour. EDMUND QUINCY, Vice President, called the Convention to order and took the chair.

Several attempts were made to disturb and break up the meeting by noise and clamor; but unsuccessfully. Messrs. Phillips and Garrison occupied the evening with eloquent and effective addresses. The whole truth of Anti-Slavery, especially in relation to the recent treacherous course of Daniel Webster, and its endorsement by some of the leading theologians of Massachusetts, was spoken fearlessly and received by the great majority of the audience with the highest satisfaction.

Adjourned to meet at Melodeon on Wednesday morning 10 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY.

Convention met according to adjournment; the President in the Chair.

Rev. CALVIN FAIRBANK, who has been recently pardoned out of the Kentucky State Prison, where he was confined years for aiding some slaves to obtain their freedom, came forward and spoke in an interesting manner. He said he entirely concurred in the sentiments of all the resolutions which the Committee had reported. He could not object at all to what H. C. Wright said. If Mr. W. had said the Bible was a lie, he would have resisted such a proposition with all his might. But Mr. W. had said no such thing.

Mr. HOSMER objected to the Resolutions, partly on account of the persons whose sentiments are quoted (O'Connell and Brougham particularly) and partly on account of the sentiments themselves. He did not believe Slavery is the sum of all villanies, nor the American owner of slaves the most despicable of men. [S. S. Foster asked him if he would name a single human right or privilege which Slavery did not cleave down. Mr. H. did not name any.] Having got upon the general question of property, and insisting upon discussing it after being called to order, and being informed he could not proceed, he appealed to the Convention. The Convention decided against him and he took his seat.

WENDELL PHILLIPS defended the resolutions. In the course of his remarks he censured the reporters for the daily papers, for the caricatured and often wholly false reports given of the meetings of the Convention. The rebuke was generally concurred in, as well-merited.

SAMUEL MAY, Jr., asked leave to state a fact in confirmation of what Mr. Phillips had said of the reporters. He gave a brief conversation had the day previous with the reporter for the *New York Herald* who declined copying the resolutions when handed to him, though told that they were important to a fair understanding of the object of the meeting, saying he *only wanted the jokes.*

Voted, on motion of Mr. Phillips, That the Convention will now take up the question of plans and funds for the ensuing year.

The following resolution was offered by Mr. May:

12. *Resolved*, That this Convention recommend to the Massachusetts A. S. Society the holding of a Hundred Conventions in the New England States, for the purpose of agitating the question of Slavery with regard to the particular phases it presents at this time, and especially with regard to the duty of the people of the North to refuse assistance in the rendition of fugitive slaves, and that it now proceed to take up funds and pledges for the support of that measure.

ABBY KELLEY FOSTER advocated the resolution.

W. L. GARRISON took up the subject of the reports for the Daily papers again, read to the Convention several untrue, unmeaning, and impertinent sentences from those reports, and rebuked their authors.

Adjourned to the afternoon.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

Called to order by FRANCIS JACKSON, President.

Mr. ABBOT, reporter for the *N. Y. Herald*, made a brief statement, admitting the correctness of what Mr. May had said in the morning, so far as he stated it; but wished to add that he had copied the two resolutions on Daniel Webster into his report.

ADIN BALLOU of Hopedale addressed the Convention.

THEODORE PARKER followed in a speech of great ability; he spoke about an hour and a half.

HENRY C. WRIGHT, with consent of Business Committee, introduced the two following resolutions:

13. *Resolved*, That it is the right of the slave to escape from Slavery, and his duty to do so whenever he thinks he can succeed in the effort.

14. *Resolved*, That the taking, by the flying slave, of any article of property really necessary to his escape from bondage is justifiable, since Slavery is but a continued state of war, and all nations have recognized this right when either party use it in self-defence, and in so peculiar an instance as Slavery, a war of individual on individual, even individual property becomes liable; and further in defending oneself against a nation banded to enslave you, every weapon you can snatch from your enemy's hand, it is lawful to use.

15. *Resolved*, That we hereby pledge ourselves to the slaves slaveholders and to abettors of Slavery, north and South, that we will exert ourselves to induce the slaves to escape from their masters, and, whenever they come among us, to welcome them to an enjoyment of all the industrial, intellectual, social, political, and rights and privileges which we ourselves enjoy, that we will trample on all constitutions, all legislative enactments, all judicial decisions, all compromises, and all precepts and commands, that require the rendition of fugitive slaves; and that, should Congress be so regardless of justice and the rights of man as to pass any law forbidding us to harbor fugitive slaves, and requiring us to aid the slaveholder or the United States Marshal in returning such fugitives, we will oppose the execution of such laws, and do what we can to make them null and void.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER took the floor, to show what had been the course of the Churches of this country towards the Anti-Slavery cause. He paid an earnest tribute of respect to Theodore Parker.

Adjourned to Cochituate Hall, at 7 3-4 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY EVENING.

Cochituate Hall was again thronged; E. Quincy, Vice President, in the chair; who read the Resolutions, and very able addresses were made by Charles C. Burleigh, Parker Pillsbury, and Wendell Phillips.

Adjourned to Melodeon, Thursday, at 10, A. M.

THURSDAY.

Convention re-assembled at Melodeon, which was entirely filled, as it was at every session of the Convention. E. Quincy, in the chair.

Mr. HOSMER endeavored to speak, though told he was out of order, as the Convention had not yet taken up any business. He insisted upon speaking, but was required to come to order, and appeal to the Convention. He did so, and the Convention sustained the chair, with but one dissenting voice.

The Resolutions heretofore reported were read by the Secretary.

Rev. JOHN L. RUSSELL, of Hingham, spoke upon the high religious character of the Anti-Slavery idea; its exaltation of the principle of the equal brotherhood of man to the highest place; in fact, teaching that we can only come to know and love and obey God by first recognizing His image

21. *Resolved*, That in the evasions, sophisms, and mere verbal subtleties of the recent decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court, which strips the colored citizen of Boston of his clear and unleniable rights in the public schools, we see, with regret, palpable evidence that the cruel and disgraceful prejudice against color, which contaminates almost every thing American, has crept as high as the Judicial Bench, and sufficed to cloud the perceptions and distort the views of those who occupy it.

22. *Resolved*, That though from weight of years and its aristocratic constitution, the Bench of our State may be beyond any direct public influence, we rejoice to remember that the public opinion at whose corrupt bidding it has filed its law is within our reach; and this consideration shall stir us to still more earnest and zealous efforts so to mould that sentiment as to show these chiefs of the law that there is a power in the State still able and disposed, in spite of their prejudices, to carry out the first line of our Constitution, and make them recognize every man as equal before the law.

The Convention was further addressed by WILLIAM A. WHITE, Esq., JAMES N. BUFFUM, P. PILLSBURY, S. S. FOSTER, and H. C. WRIGHT.

On motion of W. Phillips,

Voted, That the Convention will now proceed to vote upon all the resolutions reported, excepting those relating to Hon. Daniel Webster, and the recent decision of the Supreme Court as to the schools.

The question being taken on the Resolutions, they were adopted with great enthusiasm, without alteration.

Adjourned to meet at 1-4 to 8, P. M., in Faneuil Hall.

THURSDAY EVENING.

Long before the hour to which the Convention adjourned, Faneuil Hall was crowded in every part and in the densest manner.

At 8 o'clock the meeting was called to order by E. Quincy, who took the chair, and made some introductory remarks on the necessity of preserving order.

The meeting was then addressed by W. L. GARRISON in a speech of great force, which was attentively listened to in the main, though some disorderly persons attempted to cause disturbance.

PARKER PILLSBURY followed. The noise and disturbance increased, and several lawless fellows were removed from the Hall by the Police. Mr. Pillsbury was frequently cheered.

WENDELL PHILLIPS made the closing speech, humorous and sarcastic, and received with general approbation. Frequently the disorderly persons present attempted to create a riot; but they were foiled.

A little before 10, the Convention, having adopted the resolutions on D. Webster, and the school question, adjourned, *sine die*.

N. B. A full phonographic report of the speeches and proceedings was made, and will soon be published.

FRANCIS JACKSON, *President*.

SAMUEL MAY, Jr., } *Secretaries*.
ELIZA J. KENNY, }

REPORT OF SPEECHES.

PHONOGRAPHIC REPORT BY DR. STONE.

MELODEON....TUESDAY MORNING, MAY 28.

At the conclusion of Mr. Wright's speech, a young man, very daintily attired, mounted the platform, and bursting with 'patriotic' emotion delivered himself, with a pomposity of manner that excited general merriment, the following brief harangue,—after being introduced by the name of Sayles, from New York:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I cannot allow the remarks of the gentleman who preceded me or allow his attacks upon one of the noblest of men whom God ever put his seal upon—his attacks upon Daniel Webster and also upon Henry Clay [applause]—without offering up my word against it. It shall not pass into the country, it shall not be looked upon by the North, by the South, by our brothers all, and allowed to go to them as containing our universal ideas. No, sir! No, Mr. Chairman! No, Ladies and Gentlemen! It is not the sentiment of all of us. I, for one, honor and reverence Daniel Webster and Henry Clay, and will not allow them to be calumniated: at least, I will say one little word against the large stream that, like the cataract of Niagara, promises to carry all before it. It is not an universal sentiment. I asked the gentlemen [Mr. Wright] who was the God of our country and humanity, and he certainly did not answer it satisfactorily. I will answer it young in years as I am. It is the God of the North and of the South. Looking over us, he will not glance at any thing which is against the existence of our government. Coercion and force commonly partially sever the bands of union; but nothing is sufficient to sever entirely that band which our Washington placed his seal upon.—[Loud plaudits in the galleries and near the door.]

Mr. Charles C. Burleigh followed in reply.

SPEECH OF C. C. BURLEIGH.

An exception has been put in here against the declaration of your resolution, so far as it affects one or two individuals who come under its condemnatory expression. We may brand the mass of the people of this country as political hypocrites, so far as they are connected with the system of American Slavery, and it seems that we give no special offence to any; but if we venture among those against whom we pass this sentence to include Daniel Webster and Henry Clay, then we are to be considered as assailing some of the noblest men upon whom God ever set the seal of his patent of nobility.

Mr. Sayles—May I make an explanation? I looked upon Daniel Webster and Henry Clay as the representatives of a large number of our citizens, not upon them individually. They are the representatives of a great number of noble men, likewise. [Applause in the outskirts of the hall.]

Mr. Burleigh—A very proper explanation! [Laughter.] It is very proper that the man who holds up Daniel Webster before the nation, and would have us suppose that he is holding up the picture of the representative of noble men, should do as the Dutch painter did, who made a picture of something which he wished to be regarded as a horse, and wrote under it, 'this is a horse;' and also, that he should do as the same Dutchman did, who had to hire some one to stand by the side of his picture and read his illegible hieroglyphics.—[Laughter.]

If intellect made a nobleman, if mind and culture and refinement made a nobleman, then might Daniel Webster be regarded as noble, and fit to stand by the side of him whom the poet sang that,

'Satan excepted, none higher sat.'

But if it requires fidelity to principle, if it requires truthfulness in the heart and goodness in the life, to make a nobleman, then by the side of some of the humble and lowly of earth, let Daniel Webster hide his head in obscurity. [Cheers and hisses.]

What is the ground of the charge upon which we arraign Daniel Webster, as our friend has truly called him, as the representative of a large portion of the people of this country? We may, perhaps, by investigating that ground, and taking for granted that Daniel Webster's advocate here knows the facts of the case, arrive at some just estimate of his notions of nobility. [Applause.]

Daniel Webster has lately come before the nation and the world with the utterance of his sentiments upon certain very important matters. He has come avowing himself ready to support a certain measure of public policy. He has pointed to a certain bill that has been introduced into the Congress of this nation, and avowed himself ready to vote for it in all its provisions, to sustain it to its fullest extent.

The same man who, thirty years ago, stood upon Plymouth Rock, and pointing to the spot of New England that was desecrated by participation in the African slave trade, said, 'Let that spot be purified, or let it cease to be of New England; let it be purified, or let it be set aside from the Christian world; let it be put out of the sympathies of mankind, and let civilized man have henceforth no communion with it.' That Daniel Webster who uttered these sentiments on the Rock of Plymouth, has now come forward to pledge himself to sustain a slave trade every whit as abominable as that African slave trade, the participants in which, according to his declaration, deserved to be shut out from human sympathy and human regard. He has said that he will vote for the bill which has justly been denominated the Bill of Abominations—a bill which imposes a fine of a thousand dollars, and an imprisonment of six months upon the man who obeys the voice of his God, to hide the outcast, the command of his God, to feed the hungry and give water to the thirsty.

Let me tell you a case of which I have some direct information from eye-witnesses. A woman and her children came one dark and stormy night to the door of a citizen of Delaware, and knocked for admission. When that door was opened, he who stood there to ask of that woman her business, what could he do? He did what you and I would do. He bade them enter. They entered; they sat at his fire; they slept at his couch; they were sheltered under his roof. And for that he was considered as a criminal, was subjected to a heavy fine that stripped him of his property, and cast into prison. Did that man obey or disobey the voice of his God? Would the champion of Daniel Webster have done as that man did or otherwise?

Mr. Sayles—If this Union hung on it, I would do any thing to save the Union.

Mr. Burleigh—Let what will hang on it, if you were the owner of a habitation, and a woman and her children came in the midst of a wintry storm and knocked at midnight on your door, would you admit them?

Mr. Sayles—If that woman was to plunge the dagger in our hearts for admitting her, I would not do it.

Mr. Burleigh—I understand him to say, that under the existing circumstances (for if they are not the existing circumstances they are not relative to the question), he would bolt the door.

Mr. Sayles—Supposing——

Mr. Burleigh—Supposing the facts as they existed, would you have admitted the woman and children?

A Voice—He would keep out his grandmother.

Mr. Sayles—If I knew——

Mr. Burleigh—Knowing what you do know, what would you do?

A Hibernian Voice—He would not admit his own mother.

Mr. Burleigh—My question is answered by his evasions, and not alone by him, but by the hearts of this assembly. And it is answered by this assembly as it would be by this nation. [Cheers.] As much as this nation has been corrupted and depraved by the influence of Daniel Webster and Henry Clay, as much as it has been corrupted and depraved by the influence of a pro-slavery government, not even a pro-slavery church and a pro-slavery priesthood can root out of them their duty to assist fugitives. And as I believe in a God, I am confident they never will be able to root it out altogether. You know what you would do in the case supposed; and Daniel Webster says that if you do that good, if you warm them at your fire; if you shelter them under your roof, you shall be sentenced to a fine of a thousand dollars, and an imprisonment for six months.

Is Daniel Webster a noble man? ['No, no!' 'Yes, yes.'] Is the man who will vote to put you into prison for six months because you have done an act of humanity—is that man a noble man? ['Yes;' 'No.'] Then, again, that Bill of Abominations of which I have spoken provides that every postmaster, from the capes of Florida to the farthest corner of Minesota, from the borders of New Brunswick to the shores of the Rio Grande, that every clerk and every petty officer of this United States government, shall be a judge of the last resort, from whose decision there shall be no appeal, of a man's right to the freedom of his intellect and his conscience, of a man's right to his wife and his children, of a man's right to his manhood, and every thing thereunto pertaining. It says that the government that upholds Slavery shall appoint the judges who are to administer the pro-slavery law.

Our fathers, in the days of the great struggle with the Stuarts, could say nothing more severe than that they maintained their High Commission Courts, the judges of which were dependent on the King alone. That was sufficient to stir up a rebellion that severed the head of Charles Stuart from his neck; it separated that bloody head from its body; that was enough to decide the fate of dynasties and change the course of nations. And now we are to call that man a nobleman, who, with his avowed abhorrence of every form of tyranny, who, with all his solemn pledges to be true to liberty under all circumstances, and in all places, and at all times, regardless of all temptations of interest, and all questions of policy, that man, who, in defiance of all these pledges and professions, comes forward to maintain an institution in comparison with which the High Commission Courts of the Charleses and the Jameses are the defences of liberty. [Prolonged cheers.]

Why, who of you is willing to have his right of property submitted to the decision of any postmaster or any clerk of the United States Court or any Custom House officer, that the party against him may see fit to choose? For it is the complainant who selects him. A man comes here from Georgia to look after William and Ellen Crafts; he comes from Richmond to look after Henry Box Brown; and if the man fears that the prejudices, (that is the word that Daniel has in this new Webster's dictionary,) [applause,] if he fears that the prejudices of Massachusetts will be stronger than his claim, he may come with the postmaster of Richmond, or of Macon, Georgia, or with the clerk of the United States Court in Florida—no matter where he may come from, he may bring him here. He chooses the tribunal to try whether his brother man shall be recognized henceforward as a man, shall enjoy the rights and participate in the privileges of a man, or whether he shall be driven to unrequited toil. Are you prepared to say this is a just law? Will my friend answer that question as explicitly as he did the other. [Laughter.] Are you prepared to say that a provision by which a man's right to liberty is subjected to the fiat of an insignificant postmaster of the South—that such a provision would be just?

Mr. Sayles—The postmasters obey the law.

Mr. Burleigh—But is it a just law?

Mr. Sayles—I believe that is not the law.

Mr. Burleigh—Suppose it is the law.

Mr. Sayles—I cannot suppose it.

Mr. Burleigh—Our friend could make suppositions as plenty as blackberries a little while ago [Much Laughter.]

Mr. Sayles—That is a mere personal attack.

Mr. Burleigh—Here, then, is the ground upon which we charge Daniel Webster, in common with others, Daniel Webster, as the representative of a class which, thank Heaven! is growing smaller and smaller every day—[cheers and hisses]—and, under Heaven, we can but thank the abolitionists for that. We arraign Daniel Webster and his retainers as 'traitors to humanity—the traitors most accursed.' We say that they are robbing man of his rights. We say that they are robbing God's image of its dignity. We say that they are robbing liberty and life of their safeguards. And what heightens the iniquity, they are doing it in defiance of their pledges. They cannot advance a hair's-breadth without advancing over their own solemnly uttered sentiments. Now, what is that? I do not care for the use of terms. You may name it what you will. You may call it hypocrisy, because these men pledged themselves to a different practice; or, to excuse them from hypocrisy, you may say that they don't believe any thing different and don't profess any thing different; then you make them the open advocates of the most horrible of abominations.

I wish to say a word about an observation that has been made here by the defender of Mr. Webster, and prefaced by an 'if.' 'If the Union,' we have been told, 'is to be endangered by that law of Christianity which calls upon us to shelter the wanderer—if the Union of these States is to be endangered by our daring to obey the example of the apostles, who said, when they were opposed, "whether it is right to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye," then we will obey the law, and stand by the Union of the States.' Then, I say unto you, in the words of the ancient Hebrew, 'Choose ye whom ye will serve; as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.' [Applause.]

If you choose to set up this idol god for yourselves, if you choose to take a piece of bloody parchment, tied with red tape, and, setting it up on end, to worship it, and exclaim, 'These be thy gods, O American Israel! which brought thee up out of the house of British bondage,' and exact of us to bow the knee and bend the neck before it, why, all we say is, Worship your idol gods, and much good may it do you; but as for us, when the question comes between the Union and duty to our consciences, we say, down with your Constitution, for the sake of God and humanity. [Applause and hisses.]

I thank you for that testimony—[to Mr. Sayles, who hissed.] When I said that, our friend greeted it with a hiss. He means to say, then, Down with humanity for the sake of the Union. But I say, trample under foot that covenant with Hell, that agreement with Death. I say, down with the blood-stained flag of our Union, which waves over slaves and slaveholders. I say, let us be true to Him who teaches us the brotherhood of the race, and requires of us that we love our neighbors as ourselves, and requires of us to 'do unto others as we would have others do unto us.'

'Man is more than Constitutions; better rot beneath the sod,
Than be true to Church and State while you're doubly false to God.' [Applause.]

The Constitution tells me to give back the runaway slave to his master. Well, the Constitutions of other countries have required other atrocious acts: and those who have refused to obey them have been called heroes and martyrs. What, then, is he who refuses to obey this Constitution? Call him what you will, you give the name to me.

I say, if the Constitution calls upon you or me to give up the slave, every true lover of humanity is bound to refuse it obedience, and is bound to go on persevering in obedience to the higher law. I know that there are those who sneer at the idea that there is a higher law than the Constitution. But we can bide our time. Men may sneer at the superiority of sunshine to their smoky lamps, when there is only a dim light before morning; but let them wait until the clear, broad sun of day shines thorugh the morning mists and penetrates the recesses of the earth, and then who will undertake to sneer at the god of day?

Who made the Constitution of the United States? 'We, the people.' Can we make right and wrong? Can we create the eternal distinctions which separate virtue from vice? If we can, then the Constitution which the people made is binding, let what may contravene it. But if not, and if we are not rank atheists, if we believe that there is a principle which is the foundation of justice, then your Constitutions are as the chaff of the summer threshing-floor when they oppose it. No! We deny the power of the people to create right. We deny the power of the people to change the moral essence of things. And denying that, we must appeal to a higher power.

But, they say, there is your pledge in the Constitution to return fugitive slaves.

Mr. Mellen—Daniel Webster says no such thing. He says the Democrats have done wrong about Texas, and now we will take advantage of that wrong, and will therefore go for the admission of four more slave States. He says the country has never agreed to return the runaway slave, and that therefore he will take advantage of the wrong already accomplished, will return the fugitive slave, and thus make Slavery perpetual in this country.

Mr. Burleigh—Our friend Mellen wishes to make out Daniel a worse man than I do—and that there is no need of. [Laughter.] Daniel says that the Constitution already agrees to return the runaway slave—

Mr. Mellen—No, he does not say that.

Mr. Burleigh—and he says that the Constitution makes it the duty of every citizen to turn kidnapper. That is his opinion of what the Constitution really means. He would make it obligatory on the States, as States, and upon every citizen of the State, as a citizen of the State, to return fugitives. That is the charge which we bring against Daniel, that he is, in the first place for sustaining that iniquitous——

Mr. Mellen—I wish to explain.

Mr. Burleigh—I wanted to examine just now the position of Daniel Webster under the Constitution. I think he has gone beyond the Constitution. I think he has gratuitously sinned in this matter. I think it will be practically gratuitously, too, for I do not think he will be paid. [Laughter.] I think he has gratuitously sinned in this matter of returning fugitive slaves. What is the ground upon which we are required to give back the fugitive slave? The making of the postmasters and custom-house officers judges in the case is what the Constitution does not require. It is giving more than is stipulated for. But the giving up of the runaway slave is what the Constitution has called upon us to do. Now, those who have sworn and still swear to support this Constitution, let them dispose of Daniel's argument as they may, but for those who declare that they have neither obeyed nor promised to obey this, let them take their ground; and they can take it clearly and strongly, above all these considerations. And we ask of Daniel, 'Is that a reason why a man should persevere in doing wrong, because he has promised to do it?' You tell us it is bad morality to break this promise. Does your morality require that you should keep every promise, 'good, bad and indifferent, you ever made, at all times? We need to be taught that it was better to break a wrong promise than to keep it. And if Daniel does not read the Bible, perhaps his play books might have taught him better.—In some of his old readings of Shakspeare, he might have found that,

'It is a sin to swear unto a sin,
But greater sin to *keep* the sinful oath.'

That is our faith. Why, the oath comes to this: I solemnly swear, in the name of the Most High, that I will trample upon the law of the most High; and pray that God will so help me, as I shall defy him and outrage his commandments. What do you think of such an oath as that? Is it morally binding? Yet that is the oath which Daniel Webster points you to, when he tells you it is bad morality to shelter the fugitive slave and harbor refugees from bondage, whom you have sworn to give up. Yet, Daniel is great at harboring refugees. He made a speech for the Hungarians. He believes in making this country the asylum for the oppressed of all lands, except those of our own. He believes in assisting and harboring the Italian patriots, the Hungarian patriots, the Grecian patriots, the Polish, the German, the Swiss patriots, and all the patriots in the world, this side of the other side of the Chinese wall: only when you reach this country, if you find any body who is injured, who is herded among brutes, he will return them to their oppressors. If Kossuth comes here we will welcome him; but if Ellen Crafts comes, we will send her back. If Mazzini comes, we will bestow on him the hospitality of the country; but if Henry Box Brown—a person who demands the admiration of the world for his heroic achievement to win freedom—if he should come, we will nail him into a worse box than he was ever in before. [Shame, Shame!]

And we are reminded that Daniel Webster is the representative of a class. Truly, he is, and that is their position; and these are the men whom we are called upon to recognize as bearing the broad imprint of Heaven's signet of nobility! Heaven save me from the withering touch of that sort of a signet! 'Hear, Hear.']—Judge ye whether the allegation of these resolutions is sustained by the facts of the case. Judge ye what sort of a nobility it is that can demean itself and ally itself to the trampling upon the down-trodden; and judge ye whether those who will do this will acquire a patent of nobility from Him who said, 'For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise; I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him.'

THE NEW ENGLAND CONVENTION.

THIS great event in our annual Anti-Slavery lives has just passed away, attended by the most auspicious circumstances and the most brilliant success, and will leave an impression on the great mass of mind within the reach of its influences of the most permanent and beneficent character. It is a common observation of Abolitionists, and one that has its foundation in the nature of things and the constitution of the human mind, that each successive gathering of the hosts is the most numerous and the most triumphant that has ever been known. It must be so, of necessity. This country is living very fast. It is crowding as much history into a year as used to suffice for ten. Thanks to the influence of the Anti-Slavery movement, now most emphatically acknowledged by those that deprecate it most, the issue with Slavery is becoming daily more and more distinct, and more and more distinctly understood. The wise policy of silence is become impossible. The ancient reigh of darkness is broken up. All the conjurations of the wizards of the South joined to the spells of the magicians of the North cannot bring back the reign of Chaos and Old Night. All their incantations have failed to blot out the Sun of Truth and Righteousness from the Universe. The transient clouds they have raised abide but for a day.

"To-morrow he repairs the golden flood,
And warms the nations with redoubled ray."

Slavery being thus ever busy in its works of darkness, and Anti-Slavery being equally busy in exposing its abominations, the public mind is kept in that state of excitation, which is an essential preliminary condition of a final restoration to a normal state of moral health. To this we owe the gathering and increasing interest of our public meetings. Every year supplies some new topic to serve as the rallying cry of the occasion. Now it is a stride of Slavery towards the South to lay hold of the new worlds it is ever sighing to conquer. Now it seeks to lay its gripe on the throat of the North to choke down the accents of remonstrance and silence the emotions of pity and indignation. At one time it is an escape from Slavery, the circumstances of which make plain to the dullest minds and the hardest hearts the horrors of the condition which was more dreadful than the tortures and almost certain death which were braved for the chance of deliverance from it. At another, some Northern Statesman or Divine has made his escape from the influence of the institutions of the land of his birth, and delivered up himself a willing slave, to grind in the prison-house of the oppressor, or to keep guard over his fellow-slaves. But at every hour, almost, of our history, we are met by facts issuing forth from the bosom of Slavery and returning thither again, ghastly or grotesque appearances, which serve to keep its existence and its power alive in the minds of men.

The recent treachery of Mr. Webster, the futile attempts to bolster him up, the wide-spread indignation so broadly uttered from the stern denunciation of Garrison to the softer spoken dissent of pulpits and religious presses, was what gave the key-note to the trumpet-call that summoned this Convention, and to the blast that issued from it. We have always filled up the places of our assembly long before we have finished our sessions; but, this year, we began with a full house which never was less than full from the beginning to the end. As many minds were addressed as the capacity of the rooms we had to use permitted to be present. If we had had Faneuil Hall, the only proper place for our meetings, (if possible to be obtained) both from its size and its associations, it would have been filled from the beginning to the end. Under all the disadvantages of having to use three different places of meeting, the crowds followed us about with the irresistible affinity of steel filings for the magnet. And the newspaper reports, imperfect and malicious as most of them were, helped to keep alive curiosity and even to circulate our sayings. We never had collected together a stronger force of the ablest Anti-Slavery speakers, and the number of "technical" Abolitionists collected was never larger. In short, there was never a more favorable opportunity of making an impression on the Anti-Slavery and the general mind of the country, and never was favorable opportunity better improved.

For the specific details of the several sessions, the order of subjects and the succession of speakers, we must refer our readers to the official account of the Proceedings. The Resolutions will well repay a careful perusal. They contain in little the pith and marrow of the Anti-Slavery movement at the present stage of its existence. They were examined, illustrated and enforced in their different ways, and with their diverse gifts, by Messrs. Garrison, Phillips, Theodore Parker, Foster, Pillsbury, H. C. Wright, C. C. Burleigh, William H. Channing, John L. Russell, Ballou, Mrs. Foster and many others. All the New England Abolitionists were rejoiced to take by the hand and listen to the voice of James W. Walker, of Ohio, who was for the first time present with us in the flesh, although we have so often heard of his good words, works and sacrifices in behalf of the Anti-Slavery cause at home. We are happy to know that this excellent man has made good use of the short time of his visit to New England, and has addressed the people in several of the principal towns within reach of Boston, with excellent effect. Samuel Brooke, of Ohio, was also present, and gave us his efficient aid in the financial department of our affairs. A plan was initiated, and funds enough raised to set it on foot, for a series of at least a Hundred Conventions in Massachusetts and the other New England States, for the purpose of agitating the question of Slavery, in its present phases, and especially as to the duty of the North to refuse to return fugitive slaves. If this plan be sustained by the Abolitionists in the spirit in which it was started, we think Mr. Webster will have small cause to congratulate himself on the success of any conspiracy of his for the suppression of the Anti-Slavery Agitation.

The evening sessions were, as usual, the most thronged and were the occasions of whatever of disorderly spirit was displayed. The two first evenings the meetings were held in Cochituate Hall, a room entirely inadequate to the purpose, and which could contain but a portion of those desirous of attending. On both, there was a disorderly element present which attempted at times to obtain the mastery, but was put down without difficulty. The closely packed audience seemed well content to endure the pressure which they had to endure for the sake of the good things set before them. The closing meeting in Fanuel Hall was one of the largest assemblages ever collected within its walls. Indeed, Daniel Webster himself could not have filled it fuller, for every seat and standing place, in the galleries and on the floor, and far out into the vestibule overflowed with one "sea of upturned faces." Of this vast audience, from four to five thousand persons, all but two or three hundred were there for the purpose of hearing what was to be said; although it is not to be supposed that all were of one way of thinking. Mr. Garrison's speech was heard from beginning to end without material disturbance. The small body of rioters rallied during the space of time necessary for Mr. Pillsbury to get the platform, and they did their best to prevent his having a hearing. In the midst of the turmoil, Mr. Pillsbury faced them calmly and seriously, and at every lull gave them a home thrust, which often made them wince. Indeed, the greatest part of his speech was heard in all parts of the hall, and his sarcastic rebukes and the keen causticity with which he set their sins in order before them, often compelled considerable intervals of silence.

Mr. Phillips, who finished the evening, soon obtained the ear of the audience, and kept it, though not without frequent interruption, throughout. The excellent wit of his illustrations, and the good humor with which he neglected or noticed the disturbers, extorted the attention even of the mass of the rioters, who were by no means a dangerous body, consisting of the sweepings of the rum shops, and a few shop-boys, with a sprinkling of better dressed young men, having the appearance of medical or law students. Whatever comfort Mr. Webster could derive from the cheers of these recruits to the ranks of his retainers, no one would be cruel enough to wish to deprive him. Certainly, whatever attention Mr. Phillips had was not owing to his keeping back any of the counsel of God. Mr. Webster's and his Retainers' relations he illustrated thus: Mr. Webster made his Speech, and his Retainers said to him, as the tipsy Duke of Norfolk said to an equally tipsy boon companion, who had fallen down in the gutter, "My friend, I cannot help you up; but I will do the next best thing in my power—*I will lie down by your side!*" Only with this difference (alluding to Mr. W.'s backing out of his unqualified support of Mason's bill, after his Retainers had endorsed it in the gross), that after they had lain down, he gets up and sneaks away, leaving them in the mire! So when he was, "in anticipation of Mr. Gliddon, unrolling the mummy of the Rev. Mr. Rogers, of Winter Street" (the same meek and holy man of God of whom our Boston Correspondent discoursed last week), and alluding to that Reverend gentleman having recently said that the Disunionists would sit down with Judas in the world to come, he spoke of his imprudence, as a Retainer of Mr. Webster, in putting such an illustration in our way, when we had heretofore contented ourselves with Benedict Arnold, and then proceeded with a parallel, after the manner of Plutarch, between those two eminent characters, the audience heard every word of it.

After Mr. Phillips had finished, the resolutions were put and passed, and the Meeting adjourned, with three tremendous cheers for the Anti-Slavery Cause, which quite put to shame those interpolated, from time to time, for Mr. Webster. All the members of the Convention, I believe, went home with a joyful feeling of victory—of the triumphant manner in which the riotous demonstrations were put down. It is but justice to say that the Mayor, Hon. John P. Bigelow, was present, with a large body of Police, of which he took the personal direction, being resolved to sustain the Meeting in its rights. In this respect, he seems to have set the Head of your City an example in the duties of Civic Magistracy, by which he may profit, if his day of grace be not passed.

E. Q.

Felony in North Carolina.

Rev. Jesse McBride, a minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and now travelling at the South, has been indicted in North Carolina, with his companion, Rev. A. Crooks, for the crime of Felony. The circumstances he thus states in a letter to the *True Wesleyan*, of this city. They held a meeting on the 11th of April, at Salem, Forsyth County, when:

"Some person or persons, I know not who, anxious, no doubt, to prevent the onward march of truth and free discussion, made it his or their business to go and search if haply he or they might find something of our incendiary character, which we might have left with some of our friends, and were rejoiced, no doubt, to find the "Ten Commandments," a little pamphlet which your readers generally have read, with a brief and simple comment, showing how Slavery violates each commandment, which I had given to a little girl, the daughter of our host. Court being in session, the pamphlet was taken before the Grand Jury, and we were indicted for Felony! We have been informed that the Sheriff followed us to the edge of Guilford County, but we had crossed the county line before he came up. The Sheriff of this county has a capias for us, but has not arrested us; report says he is waiting for us to elope; how this may be I cannot tell."

—The law which describes the crime of which these men have been guilty, and which recites the penalty, is as follows:

"If any person shall knowingly bring into this State, with an intent to circulate, or knowingly circulate or publish within this State, or shall aid or abet the bringing into this State, any written or printed pamphlet or paper, whether written or printed in or out of the State, the evident tendency whereof would be to incite insurrection, conspiracy or resistance in the slaves or free negroes and persons of color within this State, or which shall advise or persuade slaves or free persons of color to insurrection, conspiracy or resistance, such person so offending shall be deemed guilty of felony, and on conviction thereof, in any court having jurisdiction thereof, shall for the first offence be imprisoned not less than one year, and put in the pillory and whipped, at the discretion of the court; and for the second offence shall suffer death without benefit of clergy." Revised Statutes of N. C., Page 194.

—Mr. McBride adds further:

"I shall make no comments, but leave your readers to make their own, and draw their own conclusions; I, however, will remark, that Brother Crooks was not privy to my giving the pamphlet; he knew not that I had left it until we heard that we were indicted; that if I have violated the laws of this State, I refuse not to be put in the pillory, whipped and imprisoned, or even put to death; that I would dread and deplore insurrection as much as any man, if not for my own sake for others; that I have not knowingly or intentionally, violated the laws of this State, and that I appeal to and demand it as a right, that the law protect and vindicate me in the enjoyment of my rights. But, protected and vindicated or not, I have done nothing more than I believe God requires of my hands, and while I sincerely desire to live in peace with all men, yet I cannot turn recreant to God, and his dear cause."

—The pamphlet entitled 'The Ten Commandments' is one of those little tracts published some years ago by the American Anti-Slavery Society, measuring about four by three inches, and containing, perhaps, little more than a column of this paper. "The laws of the Great God," it commences by saying, "are as binding upon men of the present day as they were upon the Israelites—and they will be binding upon men to the end of time. Slaveholders are so aware of this, that when Slavery is called sinful they fly to the Bible and attempt to prove that this holy book sanctions that dreadful system of iniquity.

"In these pages we intend to show that Slavery is a violation of all the commandments, and that every Slaveholder, who persists in holding his fellow-men in bondage, after light is shed upon his conscience, will meet the wrath of God. To this end, we shall place the laws of slaveholders by the side of the laws of JEHOVAH. If they agree, we shall give up our Anti-Slavery doctrines; but if they disagree, and are found to be directly opposed to each other, then Christianity and Slavery cannot possibly be co-existent. We say, then, to the LAW AND THE TESTIMONY."

Each of the ten Commandments is then cited, and by a brief statement of the most obvious and undeniable facts of Slavery, the system is shown to be in continual conflict, from its very nature, with the laws of the Decalogue. But the laws of Almighty God, whether written in the hearts of men, or in a book, are incendiary and revolutionary in a slave community, and ought to be, if Slavery be right, suppressed at all hazards.

Cuba.

The latest news of the pirates who have invaded Cuba is contained in the following Telegraphic Dispatch from Washington to the daily press of this city, by which it seems that some of them have met with their deserts:

Official information has been received of the execution of four Americans at Cuba, and of the imprisonment of between one and two hundred others.

The Spanish authorities refused the Commander of our squadron permission to see the prisoners, or to permit them to be brought home for trial.

The frigate Congress sailed from Cuba to intercept the Spanish vessel containing a number of Americans taken prisoners from an Island near Yucatan. She was followed by a Spanish man-of-war. Captain Randolph, in command of the Congress, will rescue the Americans if he can find the vessel before she reaches Cuba.

Dispatches have been sent by this Government to the Spanish authorities of Cuba that the arrest of Americans on any other Island will not be recognized nor permitted. These dispatches went from here to Mobile this morning by telegraph.

The hanging of the scoundrels who landed upon the Island is strictly in accordance with the Law of Nations, but the seizing of American citizens who had not landed upon the Territory of Spain may lead to trouble with that power, and enable the Government of the United States to put itself in a position, in accordance with its uniform policy, in favor of the extension of Slavery. The provocation given to Spain to resort to such measures to defend her colony from revolution and civil war will be forgotten in the pretence of a desire to protect the miscreants who claim the protection of this Government, and thus with a show of right the wrong, which has been ignored by the authorities will be aided and abetted.

The Grand Jury of this city have failed to find a bill against anybody for any connection with the hostile attempt upon Cuba. In the meantime, there are rumors of a successful landing of an attachment of the expedition in another part of the Island than that from which we have had authentic news.

DR. JUDD, the ambassador from the Sandwich Islands, left this city yesterday afternoon for Washington, on a visit of courtesy to the President. He is accompanied by the Hawaiian Princes, Lot Kamehameha and Alexander Liholiho.—*City paper.*

—We hope Dr. Judd took the precaution to procure free papers for his Hawaiian princes, as otherwise the freedom of the city of Washington may be presented to to them in a *box*—namely, the stone box of the city prison.

THE SOUTHERN CONVENTION.—The Southern Convention convened at Nashville on Monday last, and, according to the Telegraphic Dispatches, the city is full of Delegates and strangers gathered there to witness the proceedings. At the latest accounts nothing had been done beyond organizing the Convention by the appointment of officers, Hon N. S. Starkey, of Mississippi, being President, and the appointment of a committee to examine the credentials of members. We do not apprehend the dissolution of the Union before the issue of our next number, when we shall report progress.

MR. CHASE'S SPEECH.—To interrupt a man when speaking, even for a moment, except by his permission, is intolerable bad manners by common consent. To permit one to commence speaking, and stop him then for three weeks before granting leave to finish is an outrage upon all rules of good breeding almost unpardonable.

—We have nevertheless been guilty of it in regard to Mr. Chase of the Senate. Nothing short of a riot would have impelled us to such a step. Our only apology is that the Mayor of New-York, the New York Press, Bishop Rynders and the rest of it, have made themselves a nine-days wonder, which we had to hold up before the nine days were over, or they were not worth looking at, while Mr. Chase's Speech is a thing which could bear to be postponed and interrupted. The Future, for which, as well as for the Present, the *Standard* is printed, will be sure to look for the remainder of Mr. Chase's Speech till found, as a thing worth looking for; while the New York Riot, and all the actors in it from Rynders down to the Mayor, will be counted only as among the many singular exhibitions of the ferocious and base pro-slavery spirit of the age, and possessing but transient interest.

☞ THE PRO-SLAVERY PRESS is delighting itself and its readers with scandalous, obscene and lying accounts of the dignified and successful Convention held last week, at Boston, and, among other absurd statements, asserts that Abby Kelley (MRS. A. K. Foster) was maltreated, taken out of the meeting, and imprisoned. The truth is, as few of our readers will need to be told, that nothing of the sort was done. Abby Folsom, a poor insane creature, and one whose insanity arises chiefly, if not altogether, from a morbid action of the most intense vanity, which makes her a troublesome member of all sorts of public meetings, was simply prevented by a policeman from entering the Convention at the Melodeon. It is an evidence of the insane pro-slavery spirit of the country, that a woman who is only entitled to commiseration should be impelled, by a rabid opposition to Abolitionism, to make herself conspicuous and mischievous in the only meetings where her presence, out of respect to her mere humanity, has ever been for a moment tolerated.

Southern Justice

A recent No. of the *Georgia Constitutionalist* reports the trial of a slave for an attempt at murder committed against the keeper of a jail in which he was confined as a fugitive. The trial took place at Carrolton, Georgia. The circumstances were as follows:

"A Mr. Green had purchased the boy Buck from a drover. Shortly after, the boy absconded and made his way to this place, on his road to Tennessee, where he had a wife. Here he was taken in February last and lodged in jail, and the owner written to. In the meantime the boy complained to Mr. Tiller of the jail confinement, and persuaded him, Mr. Tiller, to take him out, stating that he would rather be put to any kind of labor than be kept in jail. Mr. Tiller being a carpenter and wishing assistance, did take him out, and employed said prisoner for two days in splitting rails.

"On the third day, whilst engaged in the same business, and Mr. Tiller being not more than three or four feet from him, and whilst stooping down, he received a blow from said prisoner on the right side of the head just below the ear with a large wood haul, which slayed in the skull. Mr. Tiller then lying lifeless across the log, the boy took from his pocket his purse, containing money and papers, and also a pen knife, which he stuck into Mr. Tiller's thigh twice, and then absconded.—The first night he stole a horse and rode fifty miles; the horse then giving out, he walked some three miles and stole another, when he made his way to Tennessee, where he was taken and lodged in jail.

"The sheriff of this county being apprised of the fact, went after and brought him back in chains last Sunday. I saw Mr. Tiller at court, who had to be led there.—The physicians testified that they had taken several large pieces of the skull bone from the head, leaving the brains entirely exposed to view. Also, that the skull was cracked in several places. It is the general impression here that the man cannot survive it after the warm weather sets in. The doctor states that he [Mr. Tiller] lay insensible for many days, and that in 99 cases in a 100 the patient would die."

—The testimony of the physician and the "general impression" had their due effect. If the man was not killed it was clear that he ought to have been, in which case, of course, the murderer ought to be hanged. But that he was not killed was his good luck, and no merit in him who attempted the killing; he therefore should be hanged just as much as if he had committed the murder. Such seems to have been the process of reasoning, if indeed any was necessary under Southern law. The best thing, however, that can be done with a refractory slave is to hang him. If by the time a slave has come to manhood—if the expression may be allowed—and his manhood is not whipped out of him, he is not fit for a slave, and had better, for the peace of society, be strangled.

Acknowledgements to National A. S. Standard, from May 1 to June 1.

543	Joshua Barnard, North Becket, Mass.	1 00
543	Lincoln & Granger, Hindsdale, Mass.	1 00
520	Thomas A. Green, New Bedford, Mass.	2 00
524	Laura A Mckee, Delavan, Wis.	2 00
530	C. D. Palmer, Oyster Bay, N. Y.	1 00
570	Orpha Brownell, Tomhannoc, N. Y.	2 00

Miscellany.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF CHEAPNESS.

THE LUCIFER MATCH.

Some twenty years ago the process of obtaining fire, in every house in England, with few exceptions, was as rude, as laborious, and as uncertain, as the effort of the Indian to produce a flame by the friction of two dry sticks.

The nightlamp and the rushlight were for the comparatively luxurious. In the bed-rooms of the cottager, the artisan, and the small tradesman, the infant at its mother's side too often awoke, like Milton's nightingale, 'darkling'—but that 'nocturnal note' was something different from 'harmonious numbers.' The mother was soon on her feet: the friendly tinder-box was duly sought. Click, click, click; not a spark tells upon the sullen blackness. More rapidly does the flint ply the sympathetic steel. The room is bright with the radiant shower. But the child, familiar enough with the operation, is impatient at its tediousness, and shouts till the mother is frantic. At length one lucky spark does its office—the tinder is alight. Now for the match. It will not burn. A gentle breath is wafted into the murky box: the face that leans over the tinder is in a glow. Another match, and another, and another. They are all damp. The toil-worn father 'swears a prayer or two'; the baby is inexorable; and the misery is only ended when the good man has gone to the street door, and after long shivering has obtained a light from the watchman.

In this, the beginning of our series of Illustrations of Cheapness, let us trace this antique machinery through the various stages of its production.

The tinder-box and the steel had nothing peculiar. The tinman made the one as he made the saucepan, with hammer and shears; the other was forged at the great metal factories of Sheffield and Birmingham; and happy was it for the purchaser if it were something better than a rude piece of iron, very uncomfortable to grasp. The nearest chalk quarry supplied the flint. The domestic manufacture of the tinder was a serious affair. At due seasons, and very often if the premises were damp, a stifling smell rose from the kitchen, which, to those who were not intimate with the process, suggested doubts whether the house were not on fire. The best linen rag was periodically burnt, and its ashes deposited in the tinman's box, pressed down with a close fitting lid upon which the flint and steel reposed. The match was chiefly an article of itinerant traffic. The chandler's shop was almost ashamed of it. The mendicant was the universal match-seller. The girl who led the blind beggar had invariably a basket of matches. In the day they were venders of matches—in the evening manufacturers. On the floor of the hovel sit two or three squalid children, splitting deal with a common knife. The matron is watching a pipkin upon a slow fire. The fumes which it gives forth are blinding as the brimstone is liquifying. Little bundles of split deal are ready to be dipped three or four at a time. When the pennyworth of brimstone is used up, when the capital is exhausted, the night's labor is over. In the summer, the manufacture is suspended, or conducted upon fraudulent principles. Fire is then needless: so delusive matches must be produced—wet splints dipped in powdered sulphur. They will never burn, but they will do to sell to the unwary maid-of-all-work.

About twenty years ago Chemistry discovered that the tinder-box might be abolished. But Chemistry set about its function with especial reference to the wants and the means of the rich few. In the same way the first printed books were designed to have a great resemblance to manuscripts, and those of the wealthy class were alone looked to as the purchasers of the skilful imitations. The first chemical light-producer was a complex and ornamental casket, sold at a guinea. In a year or so, there were pretty portable cases of a phial and matches, which enthusiastic young housekeepers regarded as the cheapest of all treasures at five shillings. By and bye the light-box was sold as low as a shilling. The fire revolution was slowly approaching. The old dynasty of the tinder-box maintained its predominance for a short while in kitchen and garret, in farmhouse and cottage. At length some bold adventurer saw that the new chemical discovery might be employed for the production of a large article of trade—that matches, in themselves the vehicles of fire without aid of spark and tinder, might be manufactured upon the factory system—that the humblest in the land might have a new and indispensable comfort at the very lowest rate of cheapness. When Chemistry saw that phosphorus, having an affinity for oxygen at the lowest temperature, would ignite upon slight friction—and so ignited would ignite sulphur, which required a much higher temperature to become inflammable, thus making the phosphorus do the work of the old tinder with far greater certainty; or when Chemistry found that chlorate of potash by slight friction might be exploded so as to produce combustion, and might be safely used in the same combination—a blessing was bestowed upon society that can scarcely be measured by those who have had no former knowledge of the miseries and privations of the tinder-box. The Penny Box of Lucifers, or Congreves, or by whatever name called, is a real triumph of Science, and an advance in Civilization.

Let us now look somewhat closely and practically into the manufacture of a Lucifer-match.

The combustible materials used in the manufacture render the process an unsafe one. It cannot be carried on in the heart of towns without being regarded as a common nuisance. We must therefore go somewhere in the suburbs of London to find such a trade. In the neighborhood of Bethnal Green there is a large open space called Wisker's Gardens. This is not a place of courts and alleys, but a considerable area, formally divided into small gardens, where just now the crocus and the snowdrop are telling hopefully of the springtime. Each garden has the smallest of cottages—for the most part wooden—which have been converted from summer-houses into dwellings. The whole place reminds one of numberless passages in the old dramatists, in which the citizens' wives are described in their garden-houses of Finsbury, or Hogsden, sipping syllabub and talking fine on summer holidays. In one of these garden-houses, not far from the public road, is the little factory of 'Henry Lester, Patentee of the Domestic Safety Match-box,' as his label proclaims. He is very ready to show his processes, which in many respects are curious and interesting.

Adam Smith has instructed us that the business of making a pin is divided into about eighteen distinct operations; and further, that ten persons could make upwards of forty-eight thousand pins a day with the division of labor: while if they had all wrought independently and separately, and without any of them having been educated to this peculiar business, they certainly could not each of them have made twenty. The Lucifer Match is a similar example of division of labor, and the skill of long practice. At a separate factory, where there is a steam-engine, not the refuse of the carpenter's shop, but the best Norway deals are cut into splints by machinery, and are supplied to the match-maker. These little pieces, beautifully accurate in their minute squareness and in their precise length of five inches, are made up into bundles, each of which contains eighteen hundred. They are daily brought on a truck to the dipping-house, as it is called—the average number of matches finished off daily requiring two hundred of these bundles. Up to this point we have had several hands employed in the preparation of the match in connection with the machinery that cuts the wood. Let us follow one of these bundles through the subsequent processes. Without being separated, each end of the bundle is first dipped into sulphur. When dry, the splints, adhering to each other by means of the sulphur, must be parted by what is called dusting. A boy sitting on the floor, with a bundle before him, strikes the matches with a sort of a mallet on the dipped ends till they become thoroughly loosened. In the less matches the process of sulphur-dipping and dusting is repeated. They have now to be plunged into a preparation of phosphorus or chlorate of potash, according to the quality of the match. The phosphorus produces the pale, noiseless fire: the chlorate of potash the sharp cracking illumination. After this application of the more inflamable substance, the matches are separated, and dried in racks. Thoroughly dried, they are gathered up again into bundles of the same quantity: and are taken to the boys who cut them: for the reader will have observed that the bundles have been dipped at each end. There are few things more remarkable in manufactures than the extraordinary rapidity of this cutting process, and that which is connected with it. The boy stands before a bench, the bundle on his right hand, a pile of half opened empty boxes on his left, which have been manufactured at another division of this establishment. These boxes are formed of scale-board, that is, thin slices of wood, planed or scaled off a plank. The box itself is a marvel of neatness and cheapness. It consists of an inner box without a top, in which the matches are placed, and of an outer case, open at each end, into which the first box slides. The matches, then, are to be cut, and the empty boxes filled, by one boy. A bundle is opened; he seizes a portion, knowing by long habit the required number with sufficient exactness; puts them rapidly into a sort of frame, knocks the ends evenly together, confines them with a strap which he tightens with his foot, and cuts them in two parts with a knife on a hinge, which he brings downs with a strong leverage: the halves lie projecting over each end of the frame: he grasps the left portion and thrusts it into a half open box, which he instantly closes, and repeats the process with the matches on his right hand. This series of movements is performed with a rapidity almost unexampled; for in this way, two hundred thousand matches are cut, and two thousand boxes filled in a day, by one boy, at the wages of three halfpence per gross of boxes. Each dozen boxes is then papered up, and they are ready for the retailer. The number of boxes daily filled at this factory is from fifty to sixty gross.

The *wholesale* price per dozen boxes of the best matches, is Fourpence, of the second quality, Threepence.

There are about ten Lucifer Match manufactories in London. There are others in large provincial towns. The wholesale business is chiefly confined to the supply of the metropolis and immediate neighborhood by the London makers; for the railroad carriers refuse to receive the article, which is considered dangerous in transit. But we must not therefore assume that the metropolitan population consume the metropolitan matches. Taking the population at upwards of two millions, and the inhabited houses at about three hundred thousand, let us endeavor to estimate the distribution of these little articles of domestic comfort.

At the manufactory at Wisker's Gardens there are fifty gross, or seven thousand two hundred boxes, turned out daily, made from two hundred bundles, which will produce seven hundred and twenty thousand matches. Taking three hundred working days in the year, this will give for one factory, two hundred and sixteen millions of matches annually, or two millions one hundred and sixty thousand boxes, being a box of one hundred matches for every individual of the London population. But there are ten other Lucifer manufactories, which are estimated to produce about four or five times as many more. London certainly cannot absorb ten millions of Lucifer boxes annually, which would be at the rate of thirty-three boxes to each inhabited house. London, perhaps, demands a third of the supply for its own consumption: and at this rate the annual retail cost for each house is eightpence, averaging those boxes sold at a halfpenny, and those at a penny. The manufacturer sells this article, produced with such care as we have described, at one farthing and a fraction per box.

And thus, for the retail expenditure of three farthings per month, every house in London, from the highest to the lowest, may secure the inestimable blessing of constant fire at all seasons, and at all hours. London buys this for ten thousand pounds annually.

The excessive cheapness is produced by the extension of the demand, enforcing the factory division of labor, and the most exact saving of material. The scientific discovery was the foundation of the cheapness. But connected with this general principle of cheapness, there are one or two remarkable points, which deserve attention.

It is a law of this manufacture that the demand is greater in the summer than in the winter. The old match maker, as we have mentioned, was idle in the summer—without fire for heating the brimstone—or engaged in more profitable field-work. A worthy woman who once kept a chandler's shop in a village, informs us, that in summer she could buy no matches for retail, but was obliged to make them for her customers. The increased summer demand for the Lucifer Matches shows that the great consumption is amongst the masses—the laboring population—those who make up the vast majority of the contributors to duties of customs and excise. In the houses of the wealthy there is always fire; in the houses of the poor, fire in summer is a needless hourly expense. Then comes the Lucifer Match to supply the want: to light the candle to look in the dark cupboard—to light the afternoon fire to boil the kettle. It is now unnecessary to run to the neighbor for a light, or, as a desperate resource, to work at the tinder box. The Lucifer Matches sometimes fail, but they cost little, and so they are freely used, even by the poorest.

And this involves another great principle. The demand for the Lucifer Match is always continuous, for it is a perishable article. The demand never ceases. Every match burnt demands a new match to supply its place. This continuity of demand renders the supply always equal to the demand. The peculiar nature of the commodity prevents any accumulation of stock; its combustible character—requiring the simple agency of friction to ignite it—renders it dangerous for large quantities of the article to be kept in one place. Therefore no one makes for store, but all for immediate sale. The average price, therefore, must always yield a profit, or the production would altogether cease. But these essential qualities limit the profit. The manufacturers cannot be rich without secret processes or monopoly. The contest is to obtain the largest profit by economical management. The amount of skill required in the laborers, and the facility of habit, which makes fingers act with the precision of machines, limit the number of laborers, and prevent their overabundance. Every condition of this cheapness is a natural and beneficial result of the laws that govern production.—*Dickens' Household Words.*

PROFESSIONAL MEN.

Translated, partly, from Froude.

I cannot tell why it is, but I scarcely know a professional man—a doctor, a lawyer, or a clergyman—that I can like. I certainly do not know one who has been what the world calls successful, that I should in the least wish to resemble. They all appear to have accustomed themselves to sacrifice their conscientous scruples, their individual regard to what is true and just and good, to obtain success in their respective callings. They have all been required to go contrary to their judgments and conciences, in order to obtain their respective places. They have been obliged to take false oaths, or to make false vows or false professions. They have been obliged to conform to laws which they believed to be bad, or to profess faith in principles which they believed to be untrue, or to conform to customs which they believed to be vicious, or to go in some other respect contrary to their feelings and convictions.

I know that men frequently try to keep their private conscience distinct from their professional conscience: but they cannot always succeed. When people accustom themselves to do what is wrong in the way of business, or in the routine of their professions, it would be foolish to expect them always to do what is right in their private transactions—People who accustom themselves to violate the truth in their profession will hardly be truthful in their private and social intercourse. Men cannot do wrong in *any* case without injuring, to some extent, their moral feelings, their dispositions, their characters. As the dyer's hand assumes the color of what it works in, so do the natures of professional men the character of the profession by which they live. You know the lawyer, the doctor, or the professional clergyman when you see them, by their unnatural manners. They are not simply men, but particular sorts of men; and, unfortunately, they are not as they often seem to think themselves, or as they appear to wish others to think them, *more* than men, but something *less* than men—men who have sacrificed their own selves, to become the paid instruments of a vicious and unnatural system.

True, there are some exceptions—some men who, though they conformed to the unreasonable and unnatural requirements of their profession during the early period of their professional life, do, at length, assert their dignity as human beings, emancipate themselves from the trammels of their profession, set at nought the evil principles, the vicious customs, the unnatural requirements of their respective callings, and begin to act like rational and moral creatures. —men who, after having been for a time the slaves of a sect, a system, or a profession, emancipate themselves, and begin to regulate their conduct by a regard to their own sense of right, and their own views of truth. But men of this description are exceedingly rare. We seldom meet with them. It is only men of superior powers—men of unusually vigorous intellects—men of genius; spiritual giants, that can thus rise above the errors and vices of their profession, and free themselves from the horrible and unnatural thraldom to which their parents or their friends had consigned them. And even those few, who, by the exercise of their superior powers have succeeded in the world, would have succeed perhaps still better—would have succeeded still more—if they had never belonged to a profession,—if they had begun at first, as they are obliged to begin afterwards, to act on their own individual judgments.

And see how the men who thus disenthral themselves are persecuted and hated by the men whose professions and unnatural conventionalities they have dared to set at nought. It is now that the common herd of professional men reveal the most odious and pitiful traits of their professional character. With but little minds themselves, they dare to censure and condemn the greatest minds of their age.—With spirits that dare not question the grossest errors, the most palpable inconsistencies, the most unnatural customs, the most ridiculous authorities, they venture to wage war with the very spirits of heaven—with the bravest and divinest of all God's creatures. They fabricate and circulate the grossest falsehoods. They fabricate and circulate them wholesale. They give their united testimony to known and notorious calumnies. They will join even to prosecute at law superior virtue and superior skill, charge the very saviours of men's bodies with murder or manslaughter, and the saviours of mens's souls with leading people to damnation. No *faith* can be placed in professional men. In vain shall we look to them for truth and justice. In vain shall we look to them for the beauties, the excellencies, the virtues, which adorn and glorify humanity.

It is a strange thing, that so many should sacrifice themselves, should throw themselves away, for such slight or doubtful advantages. It is a strange thing, that the temptation to men to thus throw themselves away should be so fearfully strong. It is a strange thing, that so few, so very few, should preserve their self-respect; that so few should choose to please themselves rather than to please others,—that so many should choose to undo themselves, to war with themselves, to war with their better *selves*, through life, for the sake of obtaining the doubtful honors and advantages connected with trades or professions. I know of nothing that afflicts me more, than the thought, that there are so few true men in the world—so few who act in accordance with their own thoughts and their own feelings, their own convictions and their own consciences. I know no more melancholy thought, than the thought that even the men who stand at the head of affairs, the men who take the lead in society, who rule the hearts and who sway the destinies of the multitudes—the rulers, the doctors, the lawyers, the priests, the soldiers, the police men, the magistracy, and the leading tradesmen, with multitudes of others, should all accomodate themselves to systems which they more or less disapprove, which their judgments and their hearts condemn,—that they should all act upon the principle of expediency, the principle of compromise, the principle of sacrificing their truest thoughts and their divinest feelings, to convenience—the wish or will of others,—to a gaintul, easy, sociable life. I know nothing more melancholy than the thought, that the true, good man—the man who will not lie—the man who will not sin—the man who will not bow down to to the world's will against his own convictions and feelings—the man who is determined to be a man, to be himself, to think and speak and act with freedom, with courage, with respect to God, to truth, and to duty only; I say I know nothing more melancholy than the thought, that such men as these who are, in truth, the most excellent, the most lovely, the most deserving, the most venerable, the most truly human, and the most truly divine—I know nothing more melancholy than the thought that men of this description, whose only fault, if we may call it a fault, is, that they are too pure, too good, too holy for this world, should, instead of meeting with respect and love and reverence—instead of being honored for their truthfulness and virtue—instead of being rewarded with the thanks and praises of mankind as the best benefactors of their race, meet with coldness or hate, shy looks or frowns, contempt or reproach, persecution and insult. Yet so it is. The best of men meet with the cruellest treatment. The worst of men—the men who in truth, unman themselves in order to accomodate themselves to false and unnatural systems, meet with rewards and favors, with smiles and plaudits.

Still, after all, I had rather be the man,—the true, the honorable man who thinks and speaks, and acts naturally, independently, though frowns, reproaches, persecution, neglect or opposition should be my lot, than I would be the crooked, the distorted, the unnatural thing into which so many convert themselves, even though I could gain, by undoing myself all the wealth and honors of the world.

What a thought, that of all our priests, whether Catholic or Protestant, whether orthodox or heterodox there should be so few,—not one in fifty, scarcely one in a hundred, who thinks aloud; who utters to others what he whispers to himself; who reveals to others his belief or his doubts; who communicates to others his knowledge; who reveals to others his discoveries! What a melancholy thought, that from our church of England clergyman, to our unitarian ministers, so few—not one in fifty,—not one in a hundred perhaps—appears before the world as he really is: preaches to others his real creed; exhibits himself in the pulpit or on the platform, or even in the social circle, in his true character. How mournful, that they should, with scarcely an exception, act an unnatural part; practice reserve and concealment, simulation and dissimulation;—acting as if they were, what, in truth, they are not;—uttering notions which they have ceased to believe, and suppressing notions which they *do* believe;—reflecting the thoughts of others instead of saying forth their own; accommodating themselves to the views, or to the no-views, to the errors and follies, the wishes and hypocrisies, of their fellows, instead of accommodating themselves to the requirements of eternal truth and duty. It is mournful, I say, it is melancholy, to think of such things. It is not without reason that I rejoice in my own emancipation from the thraldom of sectarianism, from the Slavery of priestism, from the hypocricies of professionalism. It is not without reason that I feel such a strange, such an utter dislike for professionalists,—for simulators and dissimulators, for actors and hypocrites, for men that will not be men—and feel such a love, such a reverence, such a grateful and boundless esteem, for the truthful, the virtuous, the honest, the free, the bold, the brave—the men who dare be men; the men who would rather die, than violate the law of their being, the law of their God.

Oh my dear friends, let me assure you, that, of all things, nothing is so great, nothing so holy, nothing so godlike, nothing so divine, nothing so honorable, nothing so venerable, nothing so truly beautiful, nothing so supremely blest, as to be ourselves,—as to speak and act with perfect freedom,—as to be the vanquishers of all temptations to deceit and hypocrisy,—as to assert our independence, and, in spite of all that flesh can feel, or spirit fear, do homage to the truth, and yield obedience to the will of God, and to the will of God alone.

Yet it is astonishing how much some people can say in favor of the common professional policy; in favor of an unnatural life of spiritual suicide. It is astonishing how much they can say, in the way of argument or persuasion, in favor of a life of compromise and immoral self-sacrifice. It is astonishing, too, how difficult it is for men to resist the influences at work among men in favor of a crooked policy; how difficult it is to muster strength and courage sufficient to revere ourselves, to respect our belief of truth, and our sense of right, and to act in accordance with our convictions and our consciences. Here is a father; there a mother. Here are friends; and there are patrons. They take you by the hand. They profess regard for you. They assure you, that what so many wise and good men do, can never be wrong; that your scruples are mere fastidiousness; that your objections to the common course originate altogether in over sensitiveness; that if people should act on such principles as those which you are proposing to act upon; the world would have to stand still; that it is, in fact, little short of insanity, for a youth to set up his own opinions against the decisions of the whole world. True, they do not severely blame you. They acknowledge that they have experienced similar difficulties themselves; that they did themselves, at first, feel scruples with respect to many things. But they tell you that they found it would be folly to cherish them; that they found they might as well be out of the world, as entirely out of the fashion;—that they surrendered their scruples to the judgments of older and more experienced people;—that their scruples at length died away, and that they have no doubt, that if you will act as they acted, you will experience the same success. 'Is it possible,' say they, 'that you, of all the men in the world, at this late age, have discovered for the first time, the only true principles of wisdom, the only proper source of life? Is it possible that you alone should think yourself wiser than the whole world besides? Is it possible that your should have, the presumption to think of setting aside the common sense of mankind; that you should dare to turn aside from the paths which the wisest and best, the greatest and divinest of our race, have trod? Is it possible that you, a youth, should have the presumption to turn aside from the beaten path of ages, into new and untried courses, on which none but fools and fanatics have ever ventured? Would you be different from every body else? Do you think yourself wiser than the wisest? Do you think yourself better than the best? Is it possible, that you can deem yourself too good to do what the best and wisest men in the world are doing?' And thus they reason. And something within you seems to take their part. Is it possible that my parents, my friends, my teachers, my pastors, my patrons, my guides, are all wrong. Is it possible that they should either wish me to do wrong, or be ignorant of what it is best for me to do? Is it possible that it should really be my duty to go against their will; to set at nought their love; to disappoint their affectionate hopes and wishes, and to subject them to shame and sorrow? Can it be true that they are closing their eyes against the truth,—that they are committing their souls to evil,—that they are uniting their efforts to induce me to join them in such a fearful course? Is it not possible that I have mistaken error for truth,—mere fancies for divine revelations, and divine revelations itself for falsehood and delusion? And thus you fear, and thus you hesitate, and thus you suffer.

It is no light matter, I say, to have to resist the temptation to evil which assail the youthful reformer. It is no easy thing to stand firm in the hour of trial; to do homage to truth and to virtue, to conscience and to God, in spite of the powerful influences which assail you. We must therefore pity, while we condemn the professional multitude. Yet still this lessens not the mystery of man's earthly situation; nor does it make the mystery less melancholy. It is still a strange, it is an awful, it is a mournful,—it is a most melancholy thought, that adherence to truth, and perseverance in virtue, should be so extremely difficult;—that the violation of conscience and unfaithfulness to truth should be so exceedingly common; and that, in a world that appears to be so full of men, you should so seldom be able to meet with one who truly acts the part of a man.

One thing is certain,—those who have preserved themselves from falsehood and from sin, or those who, after having yielded to falsehood or to sin, have freed themselves from their unnatural bondage, have much to be thankful for. And it is also certain, that all who take upon themselves to be reformers, have much to do, if they would really accomplish the reforms they contemplate, and answer the great end of their existence. They have much to do, if they would render effectual service to the truth,—if they would overthrow falsehood and lies, and establish truth and righteousness in the world.

Yes, they have much to do. But the work is not hopeless. It is not impossible. It is not impossible to shake the strong-holds of wickedness and lies, to tear up the foundations of corruption and villany, and to give new strength and vigor, if not empire or dominion, to truth and righteousness.

And there is always *this* comfort—that if you can do no more, you can be a man. If you cannot make *others* men, you can preserve your *own* manhood. If you cannot raise *others* to independence, you can maintain your *own* independence. In sacrificing themselves, men cannot sacrifice *you*, against your *will*. In accommodating themselves to corrupt institutions, they cannot force *you* to accommodate yourselves to them. Though you cannot force *others* to choose what is right, you can choose what is right *yourself*. Though you cannot control the destiny of others, you can control your *own*. You can be a man, if you choose—a *true*, a *full* man. If you cannot obtain wealth without stooping to base compromise, you can secure a good conscience. If you cannot obtain popularity, you can secure peace of mind. If you cannot have all you could wish, you may still enjoy life. You can be truthful, just and intellectual, and thus secure a portion worth more than the wealth of earth; worth more than the honors of a false and hypocritical world.—*Joseph Barker, in 'The People.'*

The author of Pendennis thus *sauces*, in a London journal, some Irish editors who had made him the object of a blundering attack:

CAPERS AND ANCHOVIES.

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle:

Sir—I hope no Irish gentleman will be insulted at my recalling a story, venerable for its antiquity, of the Irish officer who, having stated that he had seen anchovies growing in profusion upon the rocks of Malta, called out and shot an Englishman who doubted his statement. As the unhappy Saxon fell writhing with his wound, the Irishman's second remarked, "Look, Sir Lucius, you have made him cut capers." "Bedad, it's capers I mane!" the gallant and impetuous O'Trigger remarked: and instantly apologized in the handsomest terms to his English antagonist for his error. It was capers he had seen, and not Anchovies, growing on the rocks; the blunder was his, but the bullet was in the Englishman's leg, who went away grumbling because the other had not thought of the truth before.

Sir, three Irish newspapers, and an Irish member of Parliament in his place in the Rotunda, have delivered their fire into me through a similar error. Every post brings me letters containing extracts from Irish papers sent to me by friends, and one of them, who is most active on my behalf, informs me that there is a body of Irish gentlemen who are bent upon cudgelling me, and who are very likely waiting at my door whilst I write from the club, where, of course I have denied myself. It is these, while it is yet time, whom I wish to prevent; and as many of them will probably read your journal to-morrow morning, you will possibly be the means of saving my bones, valuable to me and my family, and which I prefer before any apology for breaking them. The blunder of which I am the victim is at once absurd and painful, and I am sorry to be obliged to have recourse to the press for explanation.

Ten years ago I wrote a satirical story in *Fraser's Magazine*, called Catherine, and founded upon the history of the murderess Catharine Hayes. The tale was intended to ridicule a taste then prevalent for making novel heroes of Newgate malefactors. Every single personage in my story was a rascal, and hanged, or put to a violent death; and the history became so atrocious that it created a general dissatisfaction, and was pronounced to be horribly immoral. While the public went on reading the works which I had intended to ridicule, "Catharine" was, in a word a failure, and is dead, with all its heroes.

In the last number of the story of Pendennis (which was written when I was absent from this country, and not in the least thinking about the opera here), I wrote a sentence to the purport that the greatest criminals and murderers—Bluebeard, George Barnwell, Catharine Hayes—had some spark of human feeling, and found some friends—meaning thereby to encourage minor criminals not to despair. And my only thought in producing the last of these instances was about Mrs. Hayes, who died at Tyburn, and subsequently perished in my novel—and not in the least about an amiable and beautiful young lady now acting at her Majesty's Theatre. I quite forgot her existence. I was pointing my moral, such as it was, with quite a different person; and never for a single instant, I declare on my word of honor, remembering the young lady, nor knowing anything regarding her engagement at the Haymarket.

From this unlucky sentence in "Pendennis" my tribulations begin, and my capers are held up as the most wicked anchovies to indignant Ireland. *Vindex* writes to the *Freeman's Journal*, saying that I have an intention to insult the Irish nation in the person of an accomplished and innocent young lady, whom I class with the murderers and cut-throats—whereby I damn myself to everlasting infamy. The *Freeman's Journal*, in language intelligible always, if not remarkable for grammatical or other propriety, says I am "the Big Blubber man," "the hugest humbug ever thrust on the public," that I am guilty of unmanly grossness and cowardly assault, and that I wrote to ruin Miss Hayes, but did not succeed.—The *Freeman* adds, in a concluding paragraph, that there may have been some person happening to bear a name coincident with that of the *Freeman's* accomplished country woman; and that if I have "this very simple and complete defence to make, I shall hasten to offer it." I don't take in the *Freeman's Journal*—I am not likely to be very anxious about reading it; but the *Freeman* never gives me any notice of the attack which I am to hasten to defend; and, calling me coward and ruffian, leaves me. It is the anchovy-caper question settled in the approved manner.

The *Mail*, assuming that I intended insult and injury, remarks on the incriminated sentence thus, "its brutality is so far neutralized by its absurdity as to render it utterly harmless." No 2.

No. 3. The *Packet*, speaking of the judgment of both of its contemporaries, says admirably:—

"This prompt and chivalrous espousal of a lady's cause is just what we would have expected from our brethren of the Irish press, and will be no doubt a source of much gratification to Miss Hayes. But . . . we only think it fair to state that he has not been guilty of the 'incredibly gross act' of associating our pure and amiable Catharine with the murderers and tyrants about whom he has written so nonsensically"—and then follows the revelation of the mystery about the real Catharine, the writer remarking that I am neither a fool nor a madman, and that I would not outrage Miss Hayes lest some Saxon should kick me.

Sir, if some pictures of the Irish, drawn by foreign hands, are caricatures, what are they compared to the pictures of the Irish drawn by themselves?—Would any man—could any man out of Ireland—invent such an argument as the last. It stands thus;

1. I have not intended to injure, nor have I in the least injured, Miss Hayes.

2. The people who have abused me for injuring her have acted with chivalrous promptitude, and, no doubt, have greatly gratified Miss Hayes. Poor young lady! She is to be gratified by seeing a man belaboured, who never thought of her or meant her a wrong.

3. But if I had injured Miss Hayes, many Saxon boot-toes would have taught me decency—that is, capers not being anchovies gentlemen would have acted with much chivalry in shooting me—and if capers *had* been anchovies, I should richly have merited a kicking. Comfortable dilemma!

I should not have noticed this charge except in Ireland, believing that it must be painful to the young lady whose name has been most innocently and unfortunately brought forward; but I see the case has already passed the Channel, and there is no help for all parties but publicity. I declare upon my honor, then to Miss Hayes, that I am grieved to have been the means of annyoing her, if I have d ne so; and I need not tell any gentleman—what gentleman would question me?—that I never for a moment could mean an insult to innocence, and genius, and beauty.

I am, sir, your very faithful servant,

Wm. Thackeray,

Garrick Club, April 11, 1850.

A Corn Shucking in South Carolina.—"But you must hear of the corn-shucking. The one at which I was present was given on purpose that I might witness the humors of the Carolina negroes. A huge fire of *light-wood* was made near the corn-house. Light-wood is the wood of the long-leaved pine, and is so called, not because it is light, for it is almost the heaviest wood in the world, but because it gives more light than any other fuel. In clearing land, the pines are girdled and suffered to stand; the outer portion of the wood decays and falls off; the inner part, which is saturated with turpentine, remains upright for years, and constitutes the planter's provision of fuel. When a supply is wanted, one of these dead trunks is felled by the axe. The abundance of light-wood is one of the boasts of South Carolina. Wherever you are, if you happen to be chilly, you may have a fire extempore; a bit of light-wood and a coal give you a bright blaze and a strong heat in an instant. The negroes make fires of it in the fields where they work; and, when the mornings are wet and chilly, in the pens where they are milking the cows. At a plantation, where I passed a frosty night, I saw fires in a small inclosure, and was told by the lady of the house that she had ordered them to be made to warm the cattle.

"The light-wood fire was made, and the negroes dropped in from the neighboring plantations, singing as they came. The driver of the plantation, a colored man, brought out baskets of corn in the husk, and piled it in a heap; and the negroes began to strip the husks from the ears, singing with great glee as they worked, keeping time to the music, and now and then throwing in a joke and an extravagant burst of laughter. The songs were generally of a comic character; but one of them was set to a singularly wild and plaintive air, which some of our musicians would do well to reduce to notation. These are the words:

"Johnny come down de hollow.
Oh hollow!
Johnny come down de hollow.
Oh hollow!
De nigger-trader got me.
Oh hollow!
De speculator bought me.
Oh hollow!
I'm sold for silver dollars.
Oh hollow!
Boys, go catch de pony.
Oh hollow!
Bring him round de corner.
Oh hollow!
I'm goin' away to Georgia.
Oh hollow!
Boys, good-by forever!
Oh hollow!"

"The song of 'Jenny gone away,' was also given, and another, called the monkey-song, probably of African origin, in which the principal singer personated a monkey, with all sorts of odd gesticulations, and the other negroes bore part in the chorus, 'Dan, dan, who's de dandy?' One of the songs, commonly sung on these occasions, represents the various animals of the woods as belonging to some profession or trade. For example—

"De cooter is de boatman—"

The cooter is the terrapin, and a very expert boatman he is

"De cooter is de boatman
John John Crow.
De red-bird de soger.
John John Crow.
De mocking bird de lawyer.
John John Crow.
De alligator sawyer.
John John Crow."

"The alligator's back is furnished with a toothed ridge, like the edge of a saw, which explains the last line.

"When the work of the evening was over the negroes adjourned to a spacious kitchen. One of them took his place as musician, whistling, and beating time with two sticks upon the floor. Several of the men came forward and executed various dances, capering, prancing, and drumming with heel and toe upon the floor, with astonishing agility and perseverance, though all of them had performed their daily tasks and had worked all the evening, and some had walked from four to seven miles to attend the corn-shucking. From the dances a transition was made to a mock military parade, a sort of burlesque of our militia trainings, in which the words of command and the evolutions were extremely ludicrous. It became necessary for the commander to make a speech, and confessing his incapacity for public speaking, he called upon a huge black man named Toby to address the company in his stead. Toby, a man of powerful frame, six feet high, his face ornamented with a beard of fashionable cut, had hitherto stood leaning against the wall, looking upon the frolic with an air of superiority. He consented, came forward, and demanded a bit of paper to hold in his hand, and harangued the soldiery. It was evident that Toby had listened to stump-speeches in his day. He spoke of 'de majority of Sous Carolina,' 'de interests of de state,' 'de honor of ole Ba'nwell district,' and these phrases he connected with various expletives, and sounds of which we could make nothing. At length he began to falter, when the captain with admirable presence of mind came to his relief, and interrupted and closed the harangue with an hurrah from the company. Toby was allowed by all the spectators, black and white, to have made an excellent speech."—*Bryant's Notes.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

Wordsworth's Unpublished Poem and Biography. —Wordsworth has left a poem, consisting of fourteen cantos, descriptive of his life, reflections, and opinions, with directions that it should be published after his decease.

—Accounts from Iceland announce that a republic movement had broken out in that island, arising from the maintenance of a commercial monopoly, and the governor had been driven away. Troops have been despatched to quell the movement.

—A letter from Berlin states that Prince Adalbert of Prussia, the King's youngest brother, has concracted a morganatic, or "left-handed," marriage with Theresa Elssler, Fanny Elssler's sister. She is henceforward to bear the name of Madame de Bernau, which the King has sanctioned on the occasion of the marriag.

—At Leipsic, lately an Englishman made a successful experiment in the art of flying, with a machine of his own invention, before a crowd of spectators. The distance traversed is stated to have been from the St. Thomas' tower to the tower of the Schloss.

—"The Proper Study of Mankind is Man."—A writer in Notes and Queries" gives the following "wicked, but witty" epigram by La Monnoye:—

"The world of fools has such a store
That he who would not see an ass,
Must bide at home, and bolt his door,
And break his looking-glass."

—Theodore Hook.—He poured forth his extempore songs on all subjects, with a facility and a raciness which no language can describe. Only get him in the humour, and seat him before a piano, and there needed but a hint, no matter how barren, to set him off at score. No difficulties of name or subject stayed him. Whatever the theme might be—an adventure at the drawing-room, a mishap in the park, a speech in Parliament, a new invention in science—Hook seized it at once, and rhymed and sang about it *ad libertum*. Not unfrequently, the subject given might be the names of the individuals of whom the party consisted, and he invariably managed to bring them aptly cleverly, into his verse. An instant of this recorded by Mr. Barham, which we do not remember to have heard of before. A young Dane, of the not very manageable patronymic of Rosenagen, happened to be one of a party of whom it was desired that his Muse should speak. On went the improvisatore, galloping over the rest without pause or check, till at last the trial came. It was thus met:—

Yet more of my Muse is required—
Alas! I'm afraid she is done;
No, no! like a fiddler that's fired,
I'll Rosin-again and go on.

—*Fraser's Magazine for April.*

—A Duel Avoided.—A famous duellist challenged an Irish barrister for some remark made by the barrister whilst the duellist was giving his testimony on the stand in some important case. The barrister knew precisely as much about fighting as a fancy boxer knows about Milton's "Paradise Lost." His friends told him, however, that there was no way to avoid the scrape, and it was certainly expected of him either to fight or apologise. This settled the point, for the proud little Hibernian, though he would rather eat than fight, still infinitely preferred being shot to making an apology. So the duellists, with their seconds, &c, were soon upon the battle-ground. The challenger was notorious as a great pistol shot, and had fought some half-dozen duels before, in one of which he was so badly wounded as to be left a cripple for life. When other preliminaries were arranged, he requested, through his second, one favor from his adversary, which was permission to stand up against a mile-stone that was on the chosen ground. He sought no advantage, but wished to lean against the stone, being too lame to stand without support. His request was at once granted; and just as the word was about to be given, the lawyer issued his mandate to stay proceedings, as he had also a request to make. In the gravest manner in the world he solicited permission to lean against the next mile-stone; and the joke was so good that the challenger took his revenge out in a hearty roar of laughter, withdrawing his deadly defiance, and declaring that he could never shoot a man of such excellent humor.—*Reminiscences of the Georgian Era.*

—The Descendants of Robert Burns at Borneo.—There is an interest attached to all that relates to the great poet and the unsuccessful ploughman which ext nds over the whole Anglo-Saxon race. The little fact which we are about to state may, therefore, be worth noticing. For some time there has been travelling in the interior of the remote island of Borneo, and sojourning among its rude people of head-hunters a young man of the name of Burns, and this young man is the grandson of Robert Burns and "bonny Jean." This adventurous youth has not only been hospitably and kindly treated by the rude Dyaks, but a prince of the Kayan nation, the most powerful of the island, has given him one of his daughters to wife; so that the future biographers of Robert Burns will, in all human likelihood, be able to enumerate among his decendants those of a Bornean prince. Mr. Burns has discovered mines of antimony and coalfields in Borneo, more extensive than any in the world out of America. He seems, moreover, to be not only a person of great enterprise, but also a man of intelligence and good education; for he has written and bublished by far the best and most authentic account of Borneo which has hitherto been given to the public. The grand son, in short, of him who sang "on the banks of Ayr" is an intrepid and intelligent traveller in the woods of Borneo and on the equator. We do not think that the poet could have anticipated this destiny for his decendant, although, for his forefathers, it was among his aspirations, that some of them may possibly have followed the Scots kings in the charge of a host